AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. VI.—(XVI.)—MAY, 1897.—NO. 5.

OUR AMERICAN SEMINARIES.

AT last the Seminary, the chief, and pre-eminently the first, concern of a bishop in a diocese, is coming to the front, and forcing itself on the attention of priests and people. Until of late years its place in the economy of church work was altogether secondary—to be thought of only after all charitable institutions for the sick, the poor, the orphans, had been founded and provided for.

Yet all these houses of benevolence and mercy would fare badly without the presence, the sympathy and the active co-operation of the priest. He must lead the way, he must stir the hearts of the people, he must throw his soul into the proposed undertaking to ensure success. Without his ringing words of encouragement many a good work would languish.

With inrushing crowds of immigrants rapidly filling up our vast country, seldom accompanied by priests, the task of every bishop, a half century ago, was to find priests to minister to their spiritual needs. If they waited to train a boy from his youth upward, through preparatory and theological Seminary, many of this new population would perish, dying without the sacraments; many would wander to distant places, remote from even their brethren in the faith, forget-

ful of prayer, mass and sacraments, until the memory of the old religion had passed from their minds, and its love from their hearts.

The magnitude of the task was sufficient to appall the bravest, but these bishops, inured to unlooked-for difficulties of many kinds, yielded to no despondent feelings while endeavoring to gather in laborers for the ripening harvests. They placed in improvised Seminaries whatever seemingly suitable subjects came to hand. The buildings were wretched, the equipments no better ; and the professors were inadequate in number and fitness for their task. Too often the professor had to do double work, now in the Seminary, then in the college, as the pittance saved from the fees of the latter were needed to support the former. At best the arrangement was a mere make-shift. It never occurred to a layman to step forward with purse and good-will to render dutiful service to God and His Church ; nor did bishops ever place before their diocesans their obligations in this regard. It is a miracle what bishops were able to accomplish in those early days in providing a diocesan clergy. Some of the religious orders lent a helpful hand. Whatever progress was made, was achieved by the sacrifices of bishops and priests, and the generosity of poor people.

The priests of those days, still living, do not care to recall their sufferings and hardships, nor count up the number of their associates who fell by the way, victims to unwholesome food and unhealthy housing, nor think of the broken-down constitutions leaving the Seminary, that soon succumbed to the exhausting labor of the ministry. They are not overgrateful for the miserable pretence of instruction they received, while craving the highest and best to fit them for their Master's work.

In Brownson's *Review* of November, 1860, Rev. Dr. Cummings struck a warning note that the time for a change was coming. The Doctor touched tender spots and raised a howl. He may have been premature in his criticism, and perhaps inconsiderate in some expressions. Though some of his co-religionists were angered by his outspoken truths, yet many

were set a-thinking. The end of the 19th century is riper for criticism and fault-finding than was 1860.

The minds of ecclesiastics are to-day turned towards our Seminaries. We have proofs in Cardinal Gibbons' last work, "The Ambassador of Christ," in John Talbot Smith's "Our Seminaries," in Bishop Maes' papers in this Review, and in the articles of the Very Rev. J. Hogan, on clerical studies.

In other countries the trend of thought is in the same direction. Maynooth College, after a century of life, advances a step forward and seeks recognition from Rome, with the privilege of conferring Academic degrees, the same as the Propaganda and other Pontifical colleges. English Seminaries of small means and few students are combining with stronger bodies for higher studies, and more efficient results. In Padua a Seminary of advanced classes has arranged its philosophical and theological courses along lines of study satisfactory to the Sacred Congregation of Studies, and has obtained power from the Holy See to confer degrees according to the prescriptions laid down for its guidance. Spanish bishops have asked for the establishment of five Seminaries of equal grade, with similar privileges for the conferring of degrees. In 1895, the Archbishop of Mexico obtained a like favor through the Sacred Congregation of Studies.

Our efforts in Seminary work are still elementary in more ways than one. Philadelphia dared, years ago, under the late Archbishop Wood, strike out boldly for the proper housing of seminarists. He did not see why orphans in asylums, school girls in convents and boys in colleges should have palatial homes, equipped with all modern improvements for convenience, comfort and health, while candidates for the priesthood were to be herded in crowds, lacking the essential requirements for physical growth and development at the most critical period of life, under a strain of intense application to intellectual pursuits. Overbrook has been followed by Boston, St. Paul, and New York,—largest and grandest of all, as becomes the metropolis of America. San

Francisco and Dubuque are also constructing Seminary buildings worthy of their standing as archiepiscopal cities. At length the reproach, justly deserved in the past, of disregarding the health of ecclesiastical students, no longer holds good. Whatever excuse may have been alleged in former years for neglect, has no right to be heard to-day. It is not necessary, although desirable, that Seminaries should be models of architecture in exterior appearance, but it is demanded of those responsible for their construction that the ventilation, heating and lighting should not fall behind what the State provides for its criminals and naughty boys; it is rightly expected that facilities for cleanliness and exercise, as conducive to sound health, should be ample.

APPOINTMENTS OF OUR SEMINARIES.

A grand house should be grandly kept. A well-kept house means a clean house—clean in every room and in every department. Cleanliness should reign supreme everywhere, every day the year through. Filth breeds disease and vermin. Sailors on a ship at sea scour its decks till the oak wears away. Cleanliness should hold sway in the kitchen, the bakery, the pantries and store-rooms. Every nook and corner should be open to light and inspection. Good construction should exclude dark holes and hiding-places for things. The arrangements for personal decency and neatness should be ample, always ready and conveniently distributed. There is nothing experimental in providing the necessary accommodations of a well-ordered house. Every respectable architect knows what is required. Why an ecclesiastical Seminary should be deprived of them is the puzzle.

Money, ordinary intelligence, and a disposition to break away from old-time consecrated miseries and needless sufferings on the part of seminarists, will effect all desirable changes in buildings, their furnishings and equipments. There is no justifiable reason why church authorities in America should be hampered by the customs and usages of older countries, where innovations are looked on in the light

of sacrileges. Even in some of the old countries the light of improvement is breaking its way into the dungeon-like barracks of Seminaries, and the health and convenience of their inmates are taken into account, as favoring intellectual progress along with physical growth and development.

THE AMERICAN SEMINARIST.

The American seminarist, as a rule, must be prepared for the ministry in America. There may be some objection to this statement. It often has met with denial. The priest of to-day has to deal largely with the children of the country. It is idle to discuss the superiority or inferiority of European parents as compared with their children. Even European children, who land on our shores in the company of their parents, change quickly in their new environments by the influence of associates, manners, tone of prevailing thought and education. The country that cannot bring forth its own priests, in time loses the faith.

PREPARATORY SEMINARIES.

The American Seminary, then, must be recruited from the children of the country. Vocations to the priesthood are born and fostered in a pious Christian home. Our country abounds with such homes. The determining guidance of this incipient vocation will be found in the preparatory Seminary. The great problem is the preparatory Seminary—how to make it what it should be, and how best to do its work. Its work is to fit its students for the higher Seminary, imbue them with a love for their vocation, and inspire them with an ecclesiastical temper, habits and mode of thought. Their training is best carried on, in and around a parish church, and, if possible, that church the Cathedral. This supposes a day-school, but a day-school reserved for candidates for the priesthood; it excludes the boarding-school. The latter, especially where secular and ecclesiastical students are mixed, destroys more vocations than it conserves. A serious objec-

tion to an ecclesiastical boarding-school lies in the length of time that these young men will have to pass in the abnormal life of a Seminary,—five or six years in the preparatory, and six in the higher Seminary, to follow out the decrees of the Third Plenary Council. The monotony wears them out. They are removed too soon from the moulding influence and training of the mother. She can correct, chastise even, without leaving a sore, or bitterness of soul. All her lessons of advice, or reproof, are sacred in the mind of her boy. She can demand more of her son than any college would dare impose.

This day-school near a Cathedral does not relieve parents of all burden of support. The diocese provides the tuition; parents living in the city, or neighborhood, continue to support their children; while boys from the rural districts find homes in approved families, at cheaper rates than can be furnished at any college. Thus both the Church and the family have a share in the expense of the boy's preparation for the priesthood. These candidates are under the eye and guidance of the bishop and his clergy from the start. Their training is strictly ecclesiastical; they have charge of the Cathedral sacristies, and all belonging thereto; they become familiar with the Church ritual and ceremonies; schooled from the first in the Church's Chant, they are heard in her songs and offices; they are seen by the people, are known as aspirants to the priesthood, and as such are judged. When they find the life too hard and irksome, or their duties distasteful, they can withdraw without a note of reproach. They have simply learned by trial that they are not of the specially called. When superiors remark radical defects, or the want of a true religious spirit, they are asked to stand to one side. The preparatory Seminary is the sifting out place. There is no inducement to keep a student a day longer than is necessary to give his supposed vocation a fair and satisfactory test. When he goes to the higher Seminary he knows what is before him; his superiors know what they are receiving. The course of studies in the first Seminary prepares for the second. Its pupils may not have read and construed as many

authors as are read by graduates of the secular colleges, but they know Latin, and are prepared to begin the study of philosophy in that language from the first day. No Rochester student is admitted to its preparatory Seminary until he has passed the Regents' examination of the State of New York. This ordeal proves that he is no dunce, and that his elementary English education has been seen to. But when the preparatory Seminary must be a boarding-school, let it be away and apart from the higher Seminary.

St. Andrew's preparatory Seminary of the diocese of Rochester started on this plan in 1870; one-half of the priests exercising the ministry in the diocese, as it was before the late addition, received their classical education in it, including four of the professors of St. Bernard's; all the young men of the diocese now in St. Bernard's followed its classes. It has this year thirty-seven pupils.

THE HIGHER SEMINARY.

The Seminary, however, with which we are specially concerned, is the higher, or the philosophical and theological Seminary. The Third Plenary Council has decreed largely and in detail what courses of study are to be followed in these two Seminaries, the preparatory and the higher. These courses cover the ground well. The Council decrees that not less than six years shall be spent in following them. Perhaps the Council was in advance of its day in prescribing six full years. If it did not mean six full years, then it could not have meant seriously that the courses of study it mapped out should be completed in less time. The chapter on our higher Seminaries is overflowing with wise prescriptions for conduct and studies. Its courses of study are much the same as are followed in the Propaganda and the best Schools in Rome; they are the same as the studies insisted on in all the higher Seminaries lately sanctioned by the Sacred Congregation of Studies, in Padua, Spain, Mexico and Maynooth, with the annexed condition of conferring Academic degrees on their successful students. There is no reason to suppose

that the same privilege will be withheld from other well established and fully organized Seminaries asking for it.

EXAMINATIONS.

If, in time, the privilege of conferring Academic degrees should become common, the board of examiners, or judges, should be independent of the professorial body. It is in human nature to favor what greatly interests us. Partiality and favoritism may assert themselves. The wisdom of an outside and independent examining board is seen in the Regents of the State of New York. These Regents, through their secretary and officials, prepare the examination papers of the State schools and academies, and of all other schools that choose to come into the arrangement. The parochial schools and academies are taking their place side by side with the State schools, now that it is understood that the competition is fair, just and honorable. There is no room for favoritism; all are treated alike. The questions are not always the best; sometimes they are too severe, going beyond what has been taught in the class room. But they are no more unfair for the Catholic schools than they are for those that feed at the public crib. Since the first Catholic school, twenty-two years ago, tried these State examinations, the effect on teachers and pupils has been admirable. The religious communities of teaching Brothers and Sisters soon learned that successful teaching would be judged in each individual case by results before an unbiased tribunal; that their ability and merit as teachers must be seen in their pupils. These quickly discovered that it would not be in the power of friendly teachers to favor them ever so little in the character of the examination papers, or in passing on their work.

It is of recent date that in the United Kingdom the introduction of Government Inspection, and the bestowal of grants and distinctions, have brought about a marvelous change in English and Irish colleges and schools. It was found under this test that comparatively unknown institutions

were doing better work than others of conspicuous reputation. It is easy for old-established colleges and schools to drop into ruts, and complacently run along in them. We shall never have first-class study in our American theological Seminaries until the standard of instruction is raised high by competent authority, and the examinations are from without, and independent of the local teaching body. This idea was broached at the Third Plenary Council, but failed to arrest attention. It was in advance of its day. The day, however, is coming.

DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT.

Confronting our bishops is the question of the direction, teaching and management of our Seminaries. At the present writing there are in the United States eight theological Seminaries for our diocesan clergy, under diocesan priests; three are directed by the Sulpicians; three, by the Lazarists; two, by the Benedictines; and two, by the Franciscans. Of these only seven, Boston, New York, Baltimore, Rochester, Cleveland, Cincinnati and St. Paul, are separate and apart from any preparatory school, or secular college. In Ireland all theological Seminaries are under the control of diocesan priests except the missionary college of All Hallows, which within a few years has been placed under the Lazarists. In England Seminaries are directed by the diocesan clergy. The same rule holds in Belgium, Holland and most of the European dioceses. To hand over a Seminary to a religious order is certainly a convenient and easy way out of a difficulty. Nominally, the Seminary is still the bishop's; his authority is recognized, and at certain times he confers Orders; he has always the right to make up deficiencies in financial straits. But only by courtesy can the Seminary be called his. Still, as between a Seminary conducted by diocesan priests, which a bishop seldom visits, and one conducted by a religious order, which he visits no oftener, there is little choice. The bishop ought to be the soul and life of his Seminary. The professors ought to be his priests, imbibe his spirit, and depend on him.

THE SECULAR CLERGY AS PROFESSORS.

It is claimed, and with some show of truth, that secular priests are not willing to lead the regular and studious life of a Seminary professor. In the past there was some excuse for this assertion. It does not hold good to-day. Formerly, the newly ordained priest rushed at once into the active work of the ministry; he became absorbed in building and pushing ahead all sorts of Church enterprises. He was an active man of affairs from the start. His mind was taken up with accounts,—money-getting and money-spending. Once this fascination came over him, books of theology grew irksome and dry. Whereas now, in the Eastern portion of the United States at least, the young priest enters on his ecclesiastical career with the expectation of spending from ten to fifteen years as an assistant before having a house of his own and the liberty that waits on it. His ambitious aspirations are clipped and he ceases to soar high. If he be a man of more than ordinary intellectual ability, and the right opportunities have been given him, he may prefer the professor's chair to the unending routine of parochial drudgery; all the more readily if his position as professor be an honorable one, giving him standing in the diocese, with suitable treatment while filling the professor's chair. Such men are not picked up by chance; they are the prime subjects of the diocese, sent abroad to some of Europe's best training schools, and kept there long enough to fit them for the special branch they are to teach. It is a question of selection and expense. It is to be thought of, and prepared for, long before the first sod is turned for the erection of the contemplated Seminary. To him who is frightened at the cost only one answer is possible: Do not think of the venture, but be content with the usual hum-drum experiment and expedient. Hunt up professors who can daily teach three or four classes of most difficult matter, each subject requiring several hours of preparation; then try to do with three or four professors what of right should be the work of eight or ten. The experiment will be a failure, and the pupils will be entitled to pity. Or,

as a substitute, hand over the Seminary to a religious community, and admit defeat.

THE TEACHING.

What to teach is laid down in the Third Plenary Council. The prescriptions of the Council are explicit and full. The teaching, however, that fails to develop a love for books and study, not alone during a student's Seminary course, but in his after years, is defective. A professor up to the mark stimulates inquiry in the minds of his hearers, and shows them how to use books and how to investigate for themselves. Disputations in philosophy and theology are essential to this development of individual research and thought. In practical use among the people profound knowledge of abstruse and learned subjects will avail but little without the faculty to present this knowledge to the comprehension and grasp of the masses of the people. In other words, a young priest should come out of the Seminary with some gift of speech and pleasant delivery. He is not expected to be a Bossuet, but he can be, and he should be, a well-trained speaker in his own vernacular, having clear ideas, orderly arranged and distinctly delivered. Sacred eloquence, as one of the branches of Seminary study, looks well in a programme; its maxims as spread out in the various text-books are correct; no one thinks of disputing them. Seminary sermons accomplish little; occasionally they furnish some amusement, and give opportunity to the critics to try the humility of the preacher. At least serious defects in articulation and delivery might be remedied by earnest endeavor on the part of a competent drill-master in pulpit elocution. Careful and painstaking instruction in the English language and literature should begin with the student's first day in the Seminary, and end with his last. It should be the language of the classes in history, scripture and sciences, leaving to Latin all other studies. It seems absurd in striving to give a young man an all-round education, to keep him from familiarity with the very language in which he will have to present his ideas and

knowledge to the people for whose souls he is to become responsible.

SPIRITUAL LIFE.

Little need be said on the spiritual life of the Seminary. This is its essential work. Without it the rest becomes a danger. All bishops, all superiors, are of one mind on this point. The exercises of piety are much the same in all. Exactness in assisting at them is insisted on. They sanctify the day, and habituate the student to devotional practices and duty. These exercises, many and frequent, are, however, only a means to an end. The end should be the formation of a soul imbued with the love of God and of holy things, full of faith and tender piety, of zeal for the saving of souls redeemed by the Blood of Christ, and of generosity in a sacred cause that should extinguish selfishness and its concomitant vices, hateful in one consecrated to the ministry of the altar. The active and absorbing duties of the parish priest will need, when the hour of trial comes, all the solid piety the Seminary's preparation can furnish. It is then that his strength of conscience will be put to the test. Then he will be his own master, and a law unto himself, within the bounds of the ten commandments, with no one, perhaps, to say him nay. The solidity and comprehensiveness of his Seminary training will now be proved. He will have no superiors standing by to guide him, or whisper in his ear, when the lapses from piety begin, or selfishness crops out, or suppressed, but not eradicated, defects show their ugliness.

DISCIPLINE.

The American student is, of all known to us, the most readily amenable to discipline, to a discipline that appeals to his good sense, and which has been reasonably placed before him. By force of habit and his surroundings, he is independent in character, restless under unnecessary restraints that seem to implicate his honor, and not disposed to submit gracefully to mere whims and other people's idiosyncrasies. His schooling in the political thought and methods

of the country teaches submission to law, once it is law. He dislikes coercion, except the coercion of a manly compliance with rule and order. He cannot abide, nor should he, the faintest suspicion of espionage. His best feelings revolt at the thought. It puts him on a par with a convict, or an unprincipled schemer. The honest man chafes under the system, and the dishonest man sets himself to get the better of the watcher. Sufficient liberty to permit the eye-server to jump the traces from time to time will indicate to superiors who are held within bounds just long enough to carry them through the Seminary and land them in the priesthood. When a young man, with the help of prayer and meditation, spiritual reading and conferences, retreats and Sacraments, cannot rise up to the dignity of the sacred ministry to which he is supposed to be called, and live up to it, of himself and by himself, without constant watching, the sooner it is found out, and the church and people are saved from his services, the better it will be for both parties. The Seminary is not to partake of the nature of a reformatory, but to be a home of piety, and a school of learning and virtue for the specially called of God to the highest and holiest functions and ministry known to man.

THE COST.

It will cost money to erect and equip buildings suitable for a Seminary of the first class, with all proper improvements and facilities for efficient work. So do the convents, hospitals and asylums cost money, and in their construction nothing is omitted that conduces to the health and advantage of the inmates. The money for the Seminary can be found whenever the diocese decides that the Seminary is its first obligation, and more important than its charitable institutions. The real difficulty will lie in obtaining money for its necessary endowments. Without the endowment of its professorships it will fag, grow shaky, do half work, totter and fall. An air of uncertainty and fear for the future will hang around it. When the professor's salary has to be crimped

out of the necessary allowance for the students' food, the two will receive short allowance. Provision for professorships should come from our rich Catholics. It has not come in the past; it will never come unless the duty of the rich is firmly and persistently placed before them. It never has been thus presented. Laymen have no right to complain if progress in our Seminaries has not kept pace with the general improvement among our people. They have not entered heartily into Seminary activity and possibilities, contenting themselves with an annual dole of a dollar or two as to any charity. All the professorships in the St. Paul Seminary have been endowed, but by a non-Catholic gentleman. There are also three endowed professorships in St. Bernard's Seminary, and one scholarship. These few exceptions do not weaken the general contention; our Catholic laymen have not fulfilled their bounden duty.

The bishops in England in rearranging their Seminaries, by closing up some of the minor ones and strengthening the remainder, begin by securing the endowment of the required professorships.

St. Bernard's Seminary (Rochester, N. Y.).

The aim of this paper thus far has been to place before its readers the writer's ideas with regard to the needs of a well-ordered American Seminary. It asks for nothing that is not attainable, and that is not highly desirable. The proof is seen in the short history of St. Bernard's Seminary of the diocese of Rochester. It cannot point to bishops who were once its pupils; it cannot cite even one priest who began and completed his Seminary training within its walls. It was only in March of 1891, that the first stone of its three stone buildings was laid, and in September of 1893, that its first students took up their residence. On that day St. Bernard's had no encumbrance or indebtedness. It has contracted none since. The main building was planned for sixty-four students, each having his own room; and for nine professors, each having two rooms. The ventilation of every one of its

rooms in the three buildings, the lighting by electricity and heating by hot water, are well nigh perfect. There are absolutely no institutional odors about any of the buildings. Bath rooms and closets are ample, and are conveniently distributed on every story. Water, from springs on the premises, is in abundance, and the sewerage is direct into the Genesee river, three hundred feet from and one hundred and eighty feet below the grade of the main building. The cleanliness is, and has been, all that this article calls for. The dining-rooms are above grade, on a level with the main floor of the central building; they are airy and cheerful as becomes such useful rooms. The kitchen and all offices connected therewith are open to inspection by visitors any day and at all hours. There is no storage in the buildings of vegetables or anything liable to decay.

For indoor exercise, when the weather forbids outdoor walks, there is a gymnasium with two sets of apparatus in a room with a floor space of fifteen thousand square feet, and two bowling alleys of modern construction. It is the walk in the open air, especially the long walks on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons, of from six to nine miles, going and returning, on which most dependence is placed for maintaining good health. These walks are without supervision, to some designated point, generally to a church for a short visit, out into the country, or into the heart of the city, scattered to avoid the appearance of a band or school crowd. Full reliance is placed on the honor and manliness of the young men that they will do nothing to which their superiors might object. When a seminarist has lost the confidence and trust of his superiors he would do well to withdraw from the Seminary. Bicycle-riding is an excellent exercise for health, but not comparable to a brisk walk. Its introduction into a Seminary is of doubtful advantage. Not many of our students can afford the luxury of a bicycle, or even the renting of one. An invidious distinction begins at once between the poor and the rich. If this mode of healthful recreation is needful, then let the Seminary furnish the bicycles. This will save some heart-burnings.

The use of tobacco in any form is forbidden. It is an unnecessary indulgence, and is often hurtful. At the age of these young men, from 18 to 25 years, the nervous system is not helped by the use of narcotics, and many have occasion in after years to lament their lack of wisdom and of judicious training while in the Seminary. It is also an uncleanly, if not filthy, habit. The excuse alleged by some, that if seminarists are not allowed to smoke they will smoke anyhow, is a libel on the character of the American seminarist, betokens weakness on the part of superiors, and misapprehends the true nature of the American candidate for the priesthood. The entire domestic service of the house is under three Sisters of St. Joseph, and a sufficient number of women-help. Only women can do a woman's work. They attend to the making up of the rooms, the cleaning of the house, the kitchen, the laundry; they are the waitresses in the serving and dining rooms. Under competent direction, these women are orderly, economical and industrious. On the score of morality, they are safer than an equal number of men. An experience of forty-one years, dating from the opening of Seton Hall College in 1856, warrants this assertion. Then it must be remembered that the moment a young man is ordained, the ordinary domestic service of his home will be rendered by women. If in the Seminary the presence of women is suggestive of evil, it will be so after he leaves the Seminary. Such a young man should avoid the priesthood, or withdraw to a Trappist monastery. A pure-hearted young man will not think evil where none exists, unless some one suggests it.

READING AT MEALS.

From the dining room, reading, except during the days of a spiritual retreat, has been discarded. From time immemorial the contrary has been the rule. The change was not adopted without reflection, but after long experience. The reading is of small advantage. Few pay attention to it until toward the end of a meal. The reader is often over-fatigued, is kept from his dinner when he needs it, and then bolts his

food in his hurry to rush out to the play-ground. When there is reading at table, food is disposed of rapidly, and less time is spent in the dining room. Some look on this quick despatch as a gain; we presume to think that it is productive of many of the ills known to seminarists. An important part of a young man's training is learning to converse. No place is better adapted for this exercise than around the dining-table. There is no need to hurry up the repast, and while the courses are being changed the conversation can flow on. The extra time spent at table is not taken from the recreation hour, as pleasant talk is itself recreation. To make the conversation useful as well as pleasant, the talk at breakfast is in Latin; at dinner, in English; at supper, in German. (German is an obligatory study.) For hygienic reasons, for better relaxation of the mind, for the improvement of the students as conversationalists, it is deemed wise to dispense with reading at meals.

THE FACULTY.

The faculty consists of:

Rev. J. J. Hartley, pro-Rector and Professor of Moral Theology;

Rev. Edward J. Hanna, D. D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology;

Rev. Andrew E. Breen, D. D., Professor of Hebrew and Sacred Scripture;

Rev. Owen McGuire, D. D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy;

Rev. Andrew B. Meehan, D. D., Spiritual Director and Professor of Canon Law and Liturgy;

Rev. P. P. Libert, S. T. B., Professor of Natural Science and Librarian;

Rev. G. De Maere, Professor of Ecclesiastical History;

Rev. Ludlow E. Lapham, A. B., Professor of English and German languages.

Six of these professors are children of the diocese; two are from Belgium.

Plain Chant is taught by the Organist of the Cathedral, and is made a serious study. One lesson in the week is given by Rev. P. P. Libert, himself a pupil of the famous Bishop of Ghent, on the science and art of teaching the Catechism. Next scholastic term these lessons will be reduced to practice before an advanced class of the Cathedral Sunday-school children. The work of the seminarists in the catechism class will afterward be revised and criticised by the professsor. Elocution and the composition and delivery of sermons and homilies are under the direction of the Bishop. An extensive addition to the Cathedral will be completed before the opening of the next scholastic term, furnishing stalls in the sanctuary for seventy or eighty students, thus enabling them to assist at the chief functions and solemnities of the Church. It is only a twenty-minute ride in the trolley cars from the Seminary to the Cathedral. In listening to the preaching in the Cathedral the young men will catch the tone of its pulpit, make application of their lessons in elocution, and improve their own style to avoid defects.

The library already numbers over eight thousand volumes. The need of a large fire-proof building presses on us every day. It will have to be large enough to contain a library for fifty thousand volumes, class-rooms and laboratories for every branch of science required in a Seminary, a hall of assembly with a seating capacity of three or four hundred, and additional rooms for professors and students. In September, 1897, St. Bernard's will be filled to its utmost limit. It has as its patrons seven other bishops than the Bishop of Rochester. More are engaging places in advance for the next term.

It has been objected by some that the nicety and refinement introduced into St. Bernard's will tend to make its young men effeminate, and less prepared to endure the hard realities of missionary life. My experience has satisfied me that the finely cultured and trained student is the very one of which to make a hero. It is your coarse nature that grovels in selfishness and low ways. The latter never rises to the sublime dignity of the priesthood, nor to the fearful responsibility of its sacred obligations, nor does he ever see his own

nothingness in dealing with the immortal soul redeemed by the Blood of Christ. An arrogant priest is always found among the coarsely nurtured, whose sense of what is due to others never rises above his estimate of himself. It is the former who is ready to suffer for Christ's sake, who is condescending towards the lowly, who appreciates the sacrifices of the poor in behalf of the Church, who is ready to spend and be spent for their welfare.

A short time ago one of our professors received a letter from a layman having his home in a Western city, in relation to a poor man in whom both were interested. A few words from this letter will illustrate what has been said above: "My experience is that of an elderly man and of residence among Hindoos, Fire-worshippers and Bhuddists; and I believe there are more souls yearly lost now-a-days for want of affability and forbearance of otherwise good Christians than are yearly converted by all our Catholic missionaries throughout the world. The one virtue that should be inculcated in our seminarians is affability and gentleness, especially to the poor. . . . A priest equipped with this virtue would be more effective in saving souls than if, without it, he had the learning of St. Thomas Aquinas." The writer may exaggerate a point, but he is substantially correct. Our work in our American Seminaries is to hand over to our bishops, for the work of the ministry, priests with as much of St. Thomas as we can give them, but so gentle and affable by nature and discipline that the beauties of the doctrines they teach, of the holy things they touch, shall be illustrated in their daily lives, in their speech, their walk, their whole demeanor. They cannot rise to this standard in the ministry if they fail to aim at it in the Seminary.

In entering into the brotherhood of American Seminaries, St. Bernard's, youngest of them all, seeks to stand by its brothers, with the ambition to reach up in time to the best, forge ahead wherever it can, having as its determining purpose the formation of affable, Christian gentlemen, learned scholars, and zealous, devoted and pious priests, while striving to keep from the Sanctuary the undesirable.

An experience of over sixty years, in college and Seminary, as pupil, tutor, professor, superior and bishop, has guided me in founding St. Bernard's Seminary. God has been with the undertaking from the beginning, and blessed it beyond any merit of men. To Him be all the honor and glory.

B. J. McQUAID,
Bishop of Rochester, N. Y.

"THE LITTLE HOURS."

(STUDIES IN THE BREVIARY.)

IF THE night hours of Matins and Lauds are the remote preparation for Mass and have to be said with the sacrifice in view, of the Little Hours we may well say they are the immediate preparation for or the immediate thanksgiving after the celebration. In taking the mind of the Church, as represented in the solemn offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, we find the normal hour for Mass is that of Terce, the "holy hour" by excellence, the hour devoted to the worship of the Holy Ghost, through whom our Divine Master offered Himself. Thus, on all Sundays and feasts, in places where the choral worship is duly kept up, Prime and Terce come before Mass, and Sext and None follow it. We will endeavor in this paper to bear this division in mind in directing attention to certain of the allusions so richly strewn about the pages of our Diurnal.

I.

PRIME.

"*Now, when the morning was come, Jesus stood upon the shore;*" and as He waited there for His Apostles so does He wait for us at the Altar. The very hour, the first of a new day, is redolent with the idea of the coming Sacrifice, and

reminds us that at the very beginning of His mortal Life, Jesus was the Eternal Victim. "In the beginning of the Book it is written of Me . . Lo, I come to do Thy will." Like all the hours, save Compline, we start with the Eucharistic Prayer, *Pater Noster*, then follows the *Ave Maria*, the prayer of the Incarnation, through which we fulfill our priesthood. And as it is fitting that the great mystery of Faith be celebrated by men full of faith, so the Creed is put upon our lips that it may awaken faith in our heart. The Ambrosian hymn, *Jam lucis orto sidere* strikes the idea of the coming Sacrifice at once. (1). *Deum . . . supplices* reminds us at once of that ineffable prayer of the Canon when, at last overpowered with the sense of his own nothingness, the priest profoundly bows down before the Altar-throne on which the Victim lies, and says *Supplices Te rogamus*. The *Diurnis actibus* refers, first of all, to that great daily act of sacrifice and is a prayer that we may be shielded from distractions or anything unworthy of its sanctity. It also reminds us that each one of our actions during the day has to be done as part of the sacrifice we make of ourselves along with the Eternal High priest; (2). The *tongue*, too, which will soon speak words of peace, must be henceforth kept from strife, the *sight*, which is to gaze on the spotless gifts, no longer is to be turned to vanities; (3). our *hearts*, soon to be the guest-chamber of the King, must be made pure by *mortification*, that (4). At *close of evening* we may look back on a day spent in fitting remembrance of the glory of our Mass.

Psalm 53. *Deus in nomine tuo.* Concerning Christ and the coming Sacrifice:

1. *In nomine tuo salvum me fac;* A cry of terror at the thought of the awful holiness of the Sacrifice we are about to offer. Only in His strength can we dare to do that for which the angels even are not pure enough. *In virtute tua iudica me;* In Thy power, which is the Cross, judge me; for then I know I shall find mercy.

2. *Orationem meam;* The Sacrifice is especially *ours;* we are free to offer it or not, so we have a special right over it:

verba oris mei! the Words of Consecration coming free from our mouths indeed, but in the person of Christ Himself.

3. *Alieni* are distractions and desires, the seemingly strong ones which seek after our souls to rob us of that recollection and peace which come from placing God before our sight.

4. But God is our Upholder, and will give us strength to fulfill our ministry as He requires; and

5. Will cause our enemies to flee; for they cannot stand against the Truth. Therefore, free from all fear of

6. The molestations of the evil one, willingly and joyfully I will offer the Sacrifice, and will praise God Who is so good, and Who knows that any distractions that may now come upon us are involuntary, and, therefore, will take no heed of them; and thus

7. Secured and freed from all fear I can offer the Sacrifice without fear of mine enemies.

Psalm 118. *Beati Immaculati.* Concerning Christ, the great Observer of the Law.

Now begins that most wonderful "Psalm of the Saints," the great "Song of the Law," which forms the chief part of all the Little Hours. A wonderful thought it was of Holy Church to fix upon this as the never-changing Psalm for four out of the seven hours. The Law of God, which is its theme, is founded on His Truth; and *that* abides with us forever, and is always to be the subject of our meditations and the rule of life. Now, it seems to us peculiarly fitting that this Psalm should occupy its present place. For looking at it in its relations to the Divine Sacrifice, we are struck with an obvious interpretation. The great law of our Lord's mortal life was that of Sacrifice—the doing of the Father's will, not His own. Now, it is clear that God, being what He is, the only and infinite Being, it must be part of His Truth, and therefore the Eternal Law, that, granting the fact of creation, He should desire to be adequately worshipped by His creatures. Man, as fallen or unfallen, could never worship His Maker fittingly, as the sacrifices of goats and oxen had, in themselves, no power to please God, so if Creation is to obey

the Law of Worship, the Eucharistic Sacrifice must have been ordained from all eternity, for this is the only means whereby God can here have from His creatures the worship which is due to Him. This, therefore, is the Law of which the Psalmist sings in this long Psalm—the Law of Worship and Sacrifice. It is the Mass we must understand by the many synonyms which are used throughout this long Psalm. And the perpetual insistance, under one form or another, of this idea, that the Law is the one thing necessary, is the best immediate preparation for the fulfillment of this Law, and is also the best thanksgiving after it. In this Psalm, as in all others, the chief one who speaks is the Victim Himself; and the words of the Psalmist are true of Him in the most perfect sense. But we must take heed to ourselves that doing His work we do it in His way. The "love which is the fulfillment of the Law" will be the means of uniting ourselves with Him; and of thus making what is said of Him primarily applicable through His merits to ourselves.

It would clearly be impossible in these few pages to take each verse of the Psalm and comment on it in the sense we have indicated. But a few verses may well be taken from each of the Little Hours to show the bearing of the view we here propose.

Immaculati in via: V. 1. They are free from sin and therefore worthy to offer the Sacrifice who set themselves diligently to walk according to this Law.

V. 2. And who search out and give themselves up wholly to find out what this Law means and implies.

V. 3. Iniquity comes to us by not walking worthy of our vocation and forgetting that, like Jesus, we must be both priest and victim.

V. 9. In what way can we rule our priestly life save by the Mass?

V. 10. It is by hiding "the words" of Sacrifice in our hearts that we keep free from sin.

Retribue servo tuo: V. 1. The Revivifying grace of God is needed to keep afresh our priestly zeal and "the words" which tell us of His Law.

V. 2. Our eyes, too, have to be unclosed by Him before we can gaze upon the wonderful things of this Law.

V. 4. It is the one thing to be sought after at all times—our one thought and desire.

V. 13. It is the means of keeping alive all our fervor, and *V.* 14. Removing temptation ; and, further,

V. 16. It widens our heart and makes the way to the Altar easy and the burthen of the priesthood light.

The Capitulum: *Regi seculorum* reminds us of Him to whom we are going to offer the supremest honor and glory in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. A useful thought. We have to deal with the King of Ages, the Deathless and Unseen One, the only God. Well, then, may we cry to our Mediator to have mercy on us, for who can dwell amid the everlasting fires of the Godhead?

Bearing in mind the monastic origin of Prime and that it was the prayer of the monks before they set about their daily tasks, we can understand what follows and how we are to apply it to the great *work* of our day.

The prayer *Domine Deus* is that our words, thoughts, and deeds may be directed to that great Act of Justice (*ad tuam justitiam*) which demands that God should have a perfect act of Worship from His creatures. Then comes a reference to the Saints in union with whom (*communicantes*), as members of the same Body, we offer the Mass. To the most adorable Trinity we thrice cry for aid: To the Father, to whom we offer ; to the Son, whom we offer ; to the Spirit, by whom we offer. And the cry goes up against our three-fold enemies. It is the cry, also, of the three-fold mystical Body of Christ, a song of Faith, of Hope and of Charity.

Another direct prayer is in that wonderful versicle and response *Respice in servos tuos.*

The splendor of the Lord our God falls upon us in the Mass ; for if the hands are the hands of Jacob, the Voice is that of the Elder Brother. He it is who directs us in all "the works" of our hands and especially in "*the work ;*" for at the Altar we are other Christs clothed with His power and Person.

Imbued with this thought, well may we, in the Collect, ask Him to take possession of our soul and body and to direct and hallow, rule and govern them according to this great Law of Worship. A reference to the Epistle we shall soon read is then made in the little Chapter which ends these prayers; and, with a special blessing asked of God and a reminder of our *memento* for the dead, the Hour of Prime ceases.

II.

TERCE.

The holy hour has come; the Time of the morning Sacrifice. This, the special hour of the Holy Ghost, who came to us at our ordination for this very purpose, is, as we have said, fittingly chosen for the Celebration; for it was "at the third hour" that the Spirit came and founded the Church to carry on the Eucharistic worship instituted by its Divine Head.

Therefore, in the Ambrosian, we call upon the Holy Ghost as though referring to the *Veni sanctificator* of the offertory; *nunc*, now to attend to us and quicken our heart, mouth, tongue, mind and strength with His peace, pouring in mutual charity with our neighbors, for He tells us: "If thy brother has anything against thee, leave first thy gift at the altar and go and be reconciled with thy brother, and then shalt thou offer thy gift."

The nearer we approach to the moment of Sacrifice the more necessary it is we should meditate upon the all importance of this great Law which justifies God in His ways to man, which is the testimony of His goodness, of His justice, and the full manifestation of His Word and Truth. In and under all these guises do we find it referred to.

Legem pone V. 1. I will search out for ever the justification of God as exhibited in the Mass. For, as in a perfect picture, we see in the Eucharistic Sacrifice what God is, and what we are.

V. 2. We need to use the Gift of Understanding to search out the meaning of this Law, and the Gift of Wisdom to appreciate it and keep it ever in our heart.

V. 4. Weighty words and full of warning. Grace humbly followed alone can keep our eye single.

V. 13. Walking according to our vocation gives us a wideness of heart and breadth of mind. All God's works are large. It is the human spirit which cramps and narrows, and sees things only from a small, miserable point of view.

Memor esto V. 1. The "Word" may here and elsewhere be taken not only of the Law of Sacrifice but of the Word Incarnate, the Sacrifice Himself. The Father sees in us the Word, this gives us hope of being heard on account of His reverence.

V. 7. The name of the Lord, upon whom we are going to call, was our thought in the watches of the night.

V. 8. The Mass is our portion, the heritage we chose when we first entered the clerical state.

Bonitatem fecisti V. 1. What goodness God has shown in choosing *us* as priests to stand before Him.

V. 2. To say Mass requires goodness on our part, discipline of life as becomes one destined for the Sacrifice and the knowledge which becomes an angel of the Lord.

V. 7. It is good to be humbled by the thought of our Vocation—no room here for pride. It is God who has lifted the poor man from the dunghill and set him among the princes of his people. But the priest remains "the poor man" he was originally.

In the Little Chapter, the Responsory and the Collect we get, as in the other Hours, extracts from the Mass of the day. Hence, another link in the chain which binds the office to the Mass. Now they seem to prepare us for the Sacrifice; afterwards, they will remind us of it.

III.

SEXT.

The Sacrifice is over, and we take up again our office—this time in thanksgiving.

What time more propitious when our heart is burning within us from the Presence of the "Powerful Ruler," the

"True God" who is shedding in the darkness of our heart the splendor of His presence, as His sun is doing in the midday heaven? What time more fitting for impressing on our souls the great Eucharistic Law we have just been fulfilling: the law of worship, of thanksgiving, of expiation, of petition? And what words so powerful to enforce the lesson than these of this great Psalm? So Holy Church takes it up again and gives to the old changes rung upon the same words her own sweet interpretation adapted to the present circumstances, and suggests all manner of appropriate acts.

Defecit in salutare tuo V. 1. Our heart faints away almost at the very idea of what has happened. *Whence is it to me?* we say with holy Elizabeth.

V. 4. Confidence and fearlessness are now engendered within us: "*For I am with thee.*"

V. 8. Petition, too, begins: *According to Thy mercy quicken me.*

V. 14. Generosity: *Thine am I.* "*My beloved to me and I to him*"

Quomodo dilexi V. 1. Steadfastness for the future.

V. 3. Prudence.

V. 7. Wisdom to know that God is sweet.

V. 10. Resolution to keep the Law.

Iniquos odio habui (1) Hope that the Eternal Priesthood will be fruitful in me.

V. 8. Fearsomeness lest I fall again.—A cry for the gift of Holy Fear.

V. 12. Abandonment to God, sure of His merciful dealings with me.

V. 14. Determination "*to do*" God's will now and henceforth.

The teachings of the Mass itself are renewed in the Little Chapter, the Responsory and Prayer. What a new significance the *Dominus vobiscum* has now, and what a new tone of fervor the *Oremus!* We and our Lord who is now living in us. Even *Deo Gratias* sounds a newer depth in our being than it did before.

IV.

NONE.

The day is on the downward path, and we need a help lest we forget our Mass, the sun of our day. So None comes in to keep alive our thanksgiving on the same lines as the Church proposed at Sext.

The Ambrosian suggests this in calling God the *tenax vigor*, the *immotus* and "self-contained." All hints to us of an attitude to the great law, the secret of our life and our hope of light when upon us falls the eventide of time.

The remaining portions of the great Psalm are now taken, and furnish us with new matter for our thanksgiving.

Mirabilia V. 1. Wonder at the great testimony of God's power and work.

V. 3. May we take in its spirit and may the Mass be our very breath by which we live!

V. 5. A prayer for guidance in the way of our Vocation.

V. 11. A stirring up of zeal for the Law.

Clamavi in toto corde V. 2. Lively prayer for help to keep the Law.

V. 7. An act of faith in the Presence within us.

V. 9. Also of Humility.

Principes persecuti sunt V. 2. Fear past, courage now to sustain the strife.

V. 5. An abiding sense of thanksgiving.

V. 7. An act of Hope.

V. 11. Sureness of being heard through our Mediator.

V. 12. Joyfulness at the knowledge gained of the Law of Sacrifice.

V. 14. A free choice and confirmation on our part of this great Law.

V. 16. A conviction that through it, and by it alone, we shall be safely restored to our home, even if we have wandered like a sheep astray from the fold. This last gracious touch reminds us of the Good Shepherd who by our hands has given His life for the sheep.

The Little Chapter, being the same as was used at Prime when we were preparing ourselves for the Sacrifice, reminds us that a Mass well said and devoutly thanked for, is the best and surest preparation for the next time we stand at the Altar.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

London, England.

CANONICAL VISITATION OF THE DIOCESE.

Concilii Plenarii Baltimor. Secundi Acta et Decreta. Titul. III., n. 86.

Concilii Plenarii Baltimor. Tertii Acta et Decreta. Titul. II., n. 14.

Commentaria in Conc. Plen. Balt. Tertium. Nic. Nilles, S. J. Pars II. Tit. II., pp. 27–29.

Apparatus Juris Ecclesiastici, auctore Z. Zitelli. Lib. I., cap I., art V., *De visitatione Dioeceseos.*

THE general law of the Church ordains that the Bishop make stated visitation of all the churches and ecclesiastical institutions of his diocese; that he examine into the condition of persons, places, and things.[1]

OBJECT.

The principal purpose of the Canonical Visitation is to give the Ordinary such detailed information regarding the

1 Visitare debet Episcopus omnes ecclesias saeculares suae dioecesis, necnon ecclesias regulares curam animarum adnexam habentes, seminaria, hospitalia, aliaque loca pia, etc.; uno verbo, curare diligenter de iis omnibus quae ad personas, domus et res ecclesiasticas pertinent. (Trid. XXII., 8; VI., 4; VII., 8; XXV., 5 et 8.)

condition of his diocese as will enable him to enact just measures of reform, to strengthen the faith, influence the moral conduct of his clergy and people and to settle difficulties which may arise between them.[1]

As a secondary result it offers the priest an exceptional opportunity of contact with his ecclesiastical superior, enabling him to explain and illustrate his difficulties as well as his plans for the improvement of the parish.

Another purpose of the Canonical Visitation is to furnish data and a basis of appointments, as well as of the directions which must govern the executive officers of the diocese. The general laws of the Church provide for the holding of annual diocesan synods, and here too the fruits of the knowledge regarding the inner working of the diocese must prove of great influence in the shaping of decrees and disciplinary measures to be observed in the administration.

Hence the Ordinary enjoys, under the canons of the Church, every right and privilege which will enable him fully to accomplish these objects.[2]

The inquiry regards, in the first place, the person of the priest or cleric, his moral and official conduct. Next, the visitation extends to religious communities, their manner of observing the rule of their Order, the Novitiate, educational work, temporal management. The laity, too, may be consulted by the Ordinary as to the moral condition of the people. Zitelli adds that special inquiry is to be made regarding the adequate accommodation of free schools for Catholic children.

1 Visitationis scopus est tueri orthodoxam doctrinam et bonos mores, cohortari populum ad religionem, pacem et innocentiam, atque generatim ea providere quae sunt ad fidelium bonum ordinata. (Deshayes, Mem. Juris Can. *Officia Episcopi, n. 696.*)

2 Quoad materiam visitationis certus immotusque canon est, omnes et singulas sacras personas et loca pia intra Dioecesis ambitum consistentia, ab Episcopo visitari posse, nisi manifesta exemptione potiantur. Episcopus enim supra iis fundatam habet jurisdictionem. Cf. Barbosa de off. et potest. Episc., p. 3, art. 74.

Vis visitationis propria, seu Decretorum quae non servato juris ordine feruntur, est ut appellatio *insuspensivo* contra ea non admittatur. Bened. XIV. Const. *Ad militant. Eccl.*

Thus the Bishop ascertains the relations which exist betweon pastor and people, between priest and priest, between parish and parish. The character and frequency of the devotional exercises, the methods by which a pastor keeps his flock united, well instructed and devout, the material condition of church and school, of asylum and hospital, of parish-house and parochial associations give large indication of a rector's activity—unless his financial accounts show that he can find good architects rather than fulfill the responsibilities of pastoral work. An importaut item of the examination in the modern parish is the subject matter of reading. The literature which feeds the minds of the young in a parish is the pastor's spiritual thermometer. A good graded library for the young people; a right choice of Catholic periodicals and papers, such as are conducted on truly religious principles, and which need not exclude healthy secular literature, are a close gauge of a pastor's zeal and efficiency.

Into these and all kindred details the Bishop has the sacred duty to inquire, and no pastor can justly take exception to the action of his Ordinary when he finds faults to be corrected and improvements to be made. Even with us, where so much latitude has been allowed in the past, owing to the unsettled condition of many missions, the regular Visitation is of strict obligation: "frequenter ac regulariter visitare districti teneri," or, as the Decree of the Third Plenary Council puts it: "nullo modo omitti aut negligi possit."

Although the Sacrament of Confirmation is usually administered on these occasions, the examination of the detailed status of the parish and all that is properly connected with the same is to be performed as a distinct and separate function.[1]

1 Non solum ut Confirmationis Sacramentum administrent, verum etiam ut gregem sibi creditum bene cognoscant, eaque omnia quae spirituale ejus bonum promoveant melius provideri possint. Concil. B. Pl. II., n. 86.

TIME.

The Fathers of the Second Plenary Council considered *annual* visitation of parishes prescribed by the Council of Trent desirable wherever the circumstances permit it. In cases where the distance and other conditions of place made this impracticable they urged visitation every two years, and made it obligatory every third year. This latter limit was fixed as the universal rule for all dioceses by the Decrees o the Third Plenary Council. "Unusquisque igitur Episcopus saltem unoquoque triennio totam dioecesim perlustrare tenetur, non solum ut gregem suum cognoscat eaque omnia quae ad spirituale eorum bonum necessaria sunt suis ipse oculis perspiciat," etc.

Reasons similar to those, which call for a deviation from the general law of annual or biennial visitations, give the bishops the right to depute capable and conscientious men to perform the canonical visitation, and the Ordinary may call upon some of the neighboring bishops to give Confirmation.[1]

For the sake of facilitating the observance of a fixed order, and for the convenience of the rectors of churches who require preparation in order to receive the canonical visitation in the prescribed form, the dates and places to be visited within a given period are usually announced in advance, either at the Ecclesiastical Conferences or by circular to the clergy. We have before us the schema of a method observed in one of the largest dioceses in the Eastern district of the States. There a note is sent from the Archiepiscopal Secretary's Office in February, and again in August, in the following form:

The Very Rev. and Rev. Rectors and Superiors of Religious Houses and Institutions, who intend to have Confirmation or other Episcopal functions during this half-year are respectfully requested to send notice to this office before February 21st, (August 15th).

N. N.,

Secretary.

1 "Quod si per se ipsum facere nequeat, id per alios idoneos viros praestet, adhibito etiam pro Sacramento Confirmationis alicujus inter viciniores episcopos ministerio."

By the answers received the Ordinary is enabled to arrange the dates and combine the several episcopal functions which he is called upon to perform, so as to consult the convenience of priest and people, and save himself needless separate journeys. When the arrangements have been perfected a list is published in form of a circular and sent to all the Rectors and Superiors, on which the appointments are noted for the half-year succeeding. This includes Canonical Visitations, Consecrations, Confirmations, Religious Professions, Meetings of Diocesan Officers, with dates and places affixed.

METHOD AND MANNER.

The *Pontificale Romanum* and the Baltimore Ceremonial of 1883 serve as norm for the observance of the Ceremonies and the details of the Canonical Visitation.[1]

According to the official directions, the Bishop is to be received at the place of visitation in solemn procession. After giving the Benediction, or during the Mass, he explains to the faithful the object of his visit and the statutes of the Church which demand that he should know the members of his flock, their needs and their work, etc. Then he gives the solemn Absolution. Finally, he examines the altar, sanctuary, baptistery, sacristy, etc., as noted in the rubrics of the Pontifical. According to the custom introduced by St. Charles Borromeo, the Bishop then confirms, and blesses whatever is to be blessed specially by him. After that he hears confessions in particular and reserved cases, and receives those who desire to speak to him on matters of conscience, etc. Last of all, he examines the pastoral house and accounts, indicates what needs reform or improvement. Then he returns once more to the church to pray for the dead.

The Council emphasizes the manner in which this important function is to be carried out by adding: "gravissimum

1 The *Manual*, published as supplement to this number of the REVIEW, contains complete and accurate directions on this subject, clearing up many hitherto doubtful points, by reference to the decisions of the S. Congregation and the most approved rubricists.

hoc munus episcopale *haud praepropere vel perfunctorie* sed omni adhibita diligentia ac zelo animarum ducti perficiant."

As the temporalities of our churches are for the most part under the control of the local pastors, the Council deems it of great importance that the Bishop investigate the details of financial administration, so as to avoid injustice, scandals and dissatisfaction. For this reason the Decrees would have the Bishop take with him on his visitation two priests of administrative ability and experience, or at least one, who is to take note of the accounts, etc. Circumstances may, of course, prevent the possibility of appointing such visitors, or make it desirable that the Bishop perform this duty in person and alone, accompanied simply by a notary. Hence the appointment of "convisitatores" is suggested rather than made obligatory.[1]

REPORT AND EXPENSES.

It is understood that a written report of the status of each church and ecclesiastical institution is made on occasion of the Canonical Visitation. This report is to be kept in the Episcopal Chancery for reference.

The results of these reports furnish ordinarily the substance of the *relatio* which every Ordinary is bound to make to the Holy See on occasion of his visit *ad limina*. Since, however, these visits are obligatory upon our Bishops once only within each decade, as was explained in a previous article on the subject, the Holy See requires that a *written report* concerning the status of the diocese be sent to the S. Congregation every *five years* by each of the American Bishops. "This is done," says P. Nilles, "in order that the Sovereign Pontiff, on whom the care of the whole Church devolves, may be kept continually informed as to unusual and changing conditions of these newly instituted dioceses."

1 Quum vero, inter cetera, in temporalem Ecclesiarum administrationem accurate inquirere maximi intersit, si fieri potest secum ducat duos convisitatores, vel saltem unum, hosque eligat ex praestantioribus inter presbyteros, et praesertim ex iis qui in bonis temporalibus Ecclesiae administrandis scientia et experientia excellere noscuntur.

The ancient Canon Law decrees that the expenses of the visitation be furnished out of the revenues or funded income of the churches. As there are few or no churches in the United States which have fixed revenues, and as the rectors of our parishes are not a regularly beneficed clergy, except, according to P. Nilles, irremovable rectors, the Third Plenary Council has left the question of expenses for the Canonical Visitation to be settled by diocesan statute (in Synod).

Ὁ ΘΑΡΣΕΥΣ.

N. B.—A *Manual* containing the ceremonies and other requisites for the Episcopal Visitation of Parish-churches, the Administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation, and other kindred functions for this occasion, is sent as Supplement with this number of the REVIEW to all subscribers.

VOBISCUM SUM.[1]

WE read in St. Matthew that the eleven Apostles, having learned from the Holy Women that the Savior had risen, went to Galilee, "to the mountain, where Jesus had appointed them." There He appears to them and, in the plenitude of his authority, sends them to preach to all nations, promising to be with them to the consummation of the world.

Should we be surprised that the meeting-place is so vaguely indicated? Should we object that, in the appointment to Galilee, no mention was made of the mountain? It is not the first time that St. Matthew leaves us in such a state of uncer-

1 Matth. xxviii., 16–20.

tainty. Satan takes our Lord up into a very high mountain,[1] to show Him all the kingdoms of the world. When our Lord delivers the great discourse, the promulgation, as it were, of the New Law, He goes up onto the mountain,[2] and again it is up onto a high mountain that He brings Peter, James and John for the Transfiguration. In all these cases there is a deep symbolism beneath the historical reality; it might even be said, that the spiritual analogy, which is suggested by the local designation, is far more important in the eyes of the Evangelist than the geographical location of the place.[3] The mountain of the Temptation is not altogether a concrete reality, since from no mountain could all the kingdoms of the world be visible. The mount of the Sermon is not only a determined spot in the hilly district of the western side of the lake of Gennesareth, it is the Sinai of the Gospel, the place eminently proper to proclaim the *Magna Charta* of the Kingdom of Heaven. The mountain of the Transfiguration may be actually identified with the Thabor or the Hermon, but it is, first of all, the pedestal on which Jesus appeared in His glory. Similarly, to locate the mountain of the Resurrection, we must say, indeed, the hill where the disciples saw their Master, but more significantly that ideal place, the Holy Place of God, which is the Mount of the Sermon, as well as the Mountain of Transfiguration, the place where Jesus, now glorified in presence of those whom He has selected as His representatives on earth, decrees the foundation of His Church, and provides for the conversion of the world. Any further investigation as to the actual place of that mountain would be superfluous. The following translation, indeed, has been proposed: "And the disciples went away into Galilee into the mountain, where Jesus had given them His prescriptions,"[4] so that the place would be explicitly identified with the Mount of the Sermon. This interpretation, although not altogether alien to the mind of the Evangelist, is not literally exact. Even granting the fact, that

1 Matth. iv., 8.
2 Matth. v., 1.
3 Matth. xvii., 1.
4 Meyer-Weiss, *Matth.* p. 496.

the greater part of the Sermon on the Mount was delivered on a spot which can be determined geographically, yet we may admit that this discourse, a collation of Sentences, which were not all pronounced in the same circumstances,[1] has only an ideal unity, namely, the notion of the evangelical Law, consequently, the mountain where the whole discourse is supposed to have been delivered, participates in that ideal or rather didactic character of the composition. So it is with the case in question. One of the appearances of our Lord, especially referred to by St. Paul[2], v. g., the appearance to the five hundred brethren, may possibly have taken place on some of the Galilean hills so familiar to our Lord, and this manifestation might be identified with the one related by St. Matthew. From the mention of the eleven Apostles we would naturally expect that the narration of St. Matthew is rather that of the appearance to the Twelve[3] or to "all the Apostles," alluded to by St. Paul. But the general character of the *mise en scène*, the descriptive features of the discourse, delivered by our Savior, suggest rather the idea that the author of the first Gospel, instead of giving the details of the *appearances known by Apostolic tradition*, wished by relating only one of those appearances to sum up as a solemn truth the whole teaching of the Risen Savior, the import and consequences of the Resurrection.[4]

The appearance of Jesus is related without any specification of the particulars. "And the disciples, seeing Him, adored Him." The Apostles pay their homage to the Messiah, whom they recognize in the risen Lord. St. Matthew writes as though our Lord appeared then to His Apostles for the first and last time. One of the details is surprising and seems to be a contradiction: "And Thomas

1 On the composition of the Sermon on the Mount, see Loisy's *Evangiles Synoptiques*, p. 168 and foll.

2 I. Cor. xv., 5–7. 3 Var. Eleven.

4 That is the opinion of Maldonat. (in *Matth.* xxviii., 17), following some ancient Commentators: "Voluisse enim studentem brevitati Matthæum omnes visiones, quibus Christus discipulis apparuerat, una complecti et quidquid in illis notatu dignum acciderat, indicare.

doubted." Did not all the Apostles worship their Master? Should we understand that seven or eight of them prostrate themselves before the Savior because they believe unhesitatingly what they see, while two or three others remain standing, fearing deception? If so, the Evangelist would have simply indicated the dispositions of the latter without adding whether, and how, they were affected. It seems evident that the writer speaks summarily, and this description embraces substantially the characteristics of the different appearances of our Lord after the Resurrection. It is of no use to investigate whether on that particular occasion, which, although undeniably real, cannot be historically determined, some Apostles doubted the real presence of Jesus among them, or not. Neither the Apostles nor the disciples, whom our Lord attached to Himself during His ministry, accepted at once the idea and the fact of the Resurrection. Some among them were less prepared than others to receive the new Faith, to believe the Crucified Master would live again, and to be satisfied from the first with a Messiah glorified in Heaven, and supporting His faithful on earth only in an invisible manner. The appearances did not take place with that celerity of a lightning flash implied in the Gospel of St. Luke and in the concluding verses of St. Mark, where the story of the appearances is told in condensed form. Several were transient. Among the six enumerated by St. Paul three were to individuals. The three others were witnessed by many; but, since they did not last long and in one case at least, namely, that to the "five hundred brethren," the great majority of the disciples could only see but not hear Jesus, the evidence of the Resurrection did not deprive any of them of the merit of faith. The belief in the Resurrection was founded, no doubt, first, on the appearances of the risen Savior; secondly, on the testimonies of Holy Writ confirming this fact; thirdly, on the internal experience of the disciples, who felt they were still in living and actual communion with their Master. Jesus had left the world without abandoning them; they could still recognize Him in the breaking of the bread. Their conviction was formed

without being, so to say, forced by miracles. Some had an early conviction from the first appearances, others were tardier. How long did this work of conviction, this formation of the Christian sense, last? As long as it was necessary to the small group of Jesus' friends to recover, to reform itself and revive again in Him. Surely not more than a few days; how many we cannot tell exactly. Anyhow, the positive remembrance of their previous doubting survived among the Apostolic community, and St. Matthew reproduces here the testimony of that tradition.

"Jesus approached unto the disciples and spoke to them." Does He approach to remove the doubt? That is our first impression, but since in the discourse no allusion whatever is made to the unbelievers, it seems that the Evangelist thinks of them no longer. Jesus draws nearer, because He is going to address the disciples. Until then He had appeared only at a distance and with His ordinary demeanor. The words of the Savior form not a discourse adapted exclusively to this particular circumstance; they are a summary of the Christian Belief and of the mission of the Church, established by the Resurrection of the Divine Master. "All power is given to Me in Heaven and in earth." By His rising from the grave, Jesus enters into the plenitude of His Messianic glory, He is associated with His Father in the government of the world; He is seated at the right Hand of God; He has all power in Heaven, all power on earth. The power of which He partakes as Christ is not only over souls by faith, the right of preparing all for the great advent, but a participation of the infinite authority of God over the universe, which He created. So that word, which the Savior spoke before, is now repeated and completed: "All things are delivered to Me by My Father."[1] Invested with these full powers, our Lord confers on His Apostles a new mission: "Go ye to teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have com-

1 Matth. xi., 27.

manded you." Formerly He had told them :[1] "Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into the cities of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and going preach saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Now that the Jews have rejected the word of Salvation and have been defiled by the murder of the Son of Man, the Apostles (and here the discourse is not addressed exclusively to the eleven, who, according to the Gospel, form his audience) should bring the good tidings to all the nations of the earth.[2] Nobody is excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven; the Samaritans and the pagans may be admitted. The Kingdom of Heaven seems now even of a different character. Doubtless it will come fully with "the consummation of the world," but it is just about to be constituted in the present age by this society into which members enter through faith and baptism, and where they keep all that Jesus has commanded.

The Apostles will preach, make disciples of all nations and baptize those who will be converted to the Gospel. Baptism will be given "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," not exactly *by* the name and the power of the Father, of the Son, of the Holy Ghost, for the Greek text of the formula (εις τὸ ὄνομα) does not admit this meaning; but *in relation* to the name of the three divine Persons, in view of the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost. Baptism will be conferred with a view to the Father, who sent His Son for the salvation of the world; with a view to the Son, who died for men; with a view to the Holy Ghost, who is given by the Father and the Son. The formula of St. Matthew means the same as that of the book of the Acts and of the Epistles of St. Paul: "To baptize in the name of Jesus Christ." Both signify that baptism is administered in view of Salvation, which God has realized by His Son, and which manifests itself by the communication of the Holy Ghost. The belief in the three divine Persons, the tie produced between Them and the baptized person, are there implied

1 Matth. x., 5-7.

2 Cf. Matth. xxiv., 14; xxv., 32; xxvi., 13.

inasmuch as nobody can be baptized in view of salvation procured by the three divine Persons, without being obliged to believe in them and without being thereby in new and special relation with the three divine Persons. Just as "to gather together in the name of Jesus"[1] means to gather as His disciples, so, to be baptized into the name of Jesus means to be baptized in relation to Jesus, for the sake of salvation, which He brings to us because we believe in Him, and in order to believe in Him, to live in Him, to believe in the Father, who sends Him, to live from the Holy Ghost, whom He sends. The enumeration of the three Persons is to signify directly their share in the work of salvation, and not the metaphysical and absolute relations one to another. The word "name" is understood before the mention both of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. It cannot be denied, however, that the personal mention of the Holy Ghost and the *connumeratio* of the three Persons suppose that, independently of Their respective shares in the work of salvation, there is among Them a fundamental relation, the special character of which should be determined by other considerations than those which pervade the present discourse of our Lord.

The mention of the three divine Persons is not introduced as the necessary formula of baptism. This formula has been fixed in its precise wording by the Church.[2] The commission itself of baptizing does not mean, perhaps, what many interpreters assert, who see in it the first institution of baptism. The commandment of Christ refers directly to the action of "making disciples," not to that of baptizing. Then the Savior explains how the Apostles should make disciples by baptizing and teaching. But it is to be remarked that the object of the commandment seems to be, above all, the evangelization of the Gentiles, so that Jesus prescribes to His Apostles to do for the Gentiles what He Himself has already done for the Israelites of good will, to enroll them in the society of the faithful by baptizing and

1 Matth. xviii., 20.

2 Cf. Schanz, *Matthaeus*, p 559.

teaching them. The discourse of our Savior does not at all contradict the fourth Gospel,[1] where we see baptism in use during the ministry of the divine Master. The institution of baptism is not, therefore, attributed by St. Matthew to the risen Savior.[2] It is rather supposed to be in use, and what is prescribed by Jesus here is that it should be applied to all the nations of the world.

By baptism one becomes a disciple of Jesus. But baptism supposes a previous teaching, and the true disciple is not the one who confesses in words the name of Jesus, but he that fulfills the will of God, the law as Jesus has taught it. Consequently, the Apostles will have not only to recruit disciples by baptizing, but to prepare them, to form them, to teach them so to observe all things whatsoever Jesus has commanded. This prescription has a singularly expressive meaning, if we suppose it given on the same spot where the Sermon on the Mount was delivered, according to the implicit reference of the Evangelist.

Before His death our Lord said:[3] "Where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." Now, He says: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Worthy conclusion of the Gospel, the most beautiful in the four *Lives of Jesus* left us by Apostolic tradition! St. Mark, following step by step the testimony of tradition, concluded his narration just when the career of our Savior entered into the domain of the unseen, and the last canonical verses of the second Gospel are, as it were, the general index to the appearances narrated by the three others. St. Luke wanted to end his history of Jesus like a complete biography, and he describes the last appearance of the Savior as a final withdrawal. St. John concludes his book in the manner of a thesis, intended to prove that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Then he supplements his narrative with a series of remembrances concerning the risen Savior, and Peter and the disciple to whom we are indebted for all those narratives,

1 John iv., 2. 2 Meyer-Weiss, *Matth.*, p. 499. 3 Matth. xviii., 20.

so that the work ends now with an appendix. The author of the first Gospel remaining in a larger sphere transmitted to us the expression of a higher truth. His Christ is risen, He lives, but He does not take leave of His disciples, nor does He demonstrate His Resurrection. He is there still with them until the end of the world, that end which the reader of the Gospel meets everywhere, but which this discourse shows more remotely than it appeared from the instructions given by the Savior before His Passion. The Evangelist concludes with showing Jesus really and perpetually living in His Church. Is it possible to think of a better ending, and what more true might be said of the Resurrection? Is it not the faith of the Apostles, the faith of the Church, which bears testimony to the Resurrection of Jesus? And is not the Church itself a part of the Risen Savior? The proof of the Resurrection indicated in the first Gospel is very simple and very strong: Jesus is risen, since He is with us. After he has led us up to the mysterious mountain, where the Apostles assembled, St. Matthew leaves us, there to hear the word of the Lord: "I am with you to the consummation of the world." He did not think of saying that the Apostles descended from the mountain nor of telling what they did afterwards. He was not thinking of them after he wrote the last verses of his Gospel. The idea of Jesus being actually present in the Church, which He founded on the Apostles, dispels the preoccupations of the historian. In fact, the history of the Risen Savior has no *finale*, since "He dieth no more."[1]

ALFRED LOISY, D.D.,
Late of the Catholic University of Paris.

Neuilly, France.

1 Rom. vi., 9.

ST. VIATEUR'S COLLEGE AND SEMINARY.

(Bourbonnais, Ill.)

Near the banks of the Kankakee River is situated the quaint little village of Bourbonnais Grove. It is surrounded by one of the most fertile tracts of land on the Illinois prairies, and the inhabitants are for the most part retired farmers enjoying the sweets of a well-earned repose. The Kankakee River at this point has cut for itself a deep and winding valley, through which it wends its way to the Illinois river, about thirty-five miles northwest. Dense groves line the river on either side, and altogether the landscape around presents a beautiful scene.

The history of St. Viateur's College, though short, is interesting. It has to record numerous difficulties, but it has overcome these, and now stands on a level with the foremost educational institutions of the West. The activity of this institution began in 1865. The people of Bourbonnais Grove alive to the need of a good education for their children had made application through their pastor, the Rev. F. J. Coté, to the Very Rev. C. E. Champagneur, C.S.V., of Joliette, Canada, who was then Provincial of the community of St. Viateur. The Superior saw plainly the need there was of good teachers and sent three members of the community to open the school. These were the Very Rev. P. Beaudoin, C.S.V., R.D., Rev. A. Martel, C.S.V., and Rev. J. B. Bernard, C.S.V. The three young religious came not merely to instruct the young in secular knowledge, but to instill into their opening minds sound principles of religious doctrine to shield them from the threatening danger of apostasy. Upon their arrival they took charge of the district school, which became a parochial school, and later a commercial academy. The house they then occupied is now the refectory. It was a two-story building, 40 by 60 feet.

While Father Beaudoin administered the affairs of the parish, he kept a watchful eye over the interest of the infant school. Brother Martel acted in the capacity of director, teach-

ST. VIATEUR'S COLLEGE AND SEMINARY.

ing the French course, and Brother Bernard took charge of English and mathematics. At the end of the first year the success of the school was assured, and in order to do justice to the increasing numbers, Brother Lamarche was sent to assist. The latter became director, and Brother Martel procurator.

In 1867 a commercial course was inaugurated. The students were becoming interested, and, as they required more time to study in the evening, room was made for a limited number to sleep in the building. There were, however, no boarders. In 1868 the brothers purchased the school from the town board for $3,000, payable in teaching. They were allowed fifteen years to complete the payment. The school steadily prospered, and gained a reputation that attracted students from far and near. Father Beaudoin saw that it was bound to outgrow its present proportions and thought it would be best for the interests of the school to call for another priest, who would take charge of it and enlarge it so as to supply the demand. In answer to his appeal Joliette sent the Rev. Thomas Roy, C.S.V., and Brother Guay. With their arrival the college entered upon a new era.

Before going further we may say here that of the three teachers who first came two survive, Father Beaudoin, who is Pastor of Maternity Church and President of the Board of Trustees, and Brother A. Martel, who is now Director of the prosperous Viatorian Academy at St. Timothee, Canada. Brother Bernard died on the 24th of August, 1890, after a long and devoted career as Treasurer of St. Viateur's College.

Rev. Thomas Roy, C.S.V., arrived in Bourbonnais in August, 1868. At the beginning of the September session he inaugurated the classical course, he himself teaching the rudiments of Latin to a large class, among whom were the now Rev. Fathers J. Lesage, A. Bergeron and G. Legris; Drs. F. R. Marcotte and V. Bergeron; Messrs. F. St. Pierre and George Letourneau, Jr. Under the enlightened direction of Father Roy everything went well with the school. He was the true type of a pioneer—hardy, genial, indefatigable, per-

severing, and shrewd. He consequently won not only the good-will of the people, but also their substantial aid in realizing the purpose of building a college that would make Bourbonnais the resort of those eager for knowledge and the Alma Mater of able men in all walks of life. In the winter of 1869, in answer to an appeal made to the congregation at Bourbonnais, all the stone necessary for a new building was brought in one day by the ready and willing farmers, who were naturally anxious to see in their own parish a school in which their sons might learn to cope with the liberally educated graduates of other institutions. The long roll of Bourbonnais boys now in professional ranks, priests, lawyers, physicians, teachers and business men, is ample evidence that the hopes of those willing and intelligent helpers have been realized.

In the spring of the following year no time was lost in raising the walls of the new college. Operations began on the 3rd of April. The building measured 50 by 30 feet and was three stories high. Shortly afterwards this space was doubled in order to supply the demand for more room. In 1874 a French roof was put on the building, in which were located the two fine senior and junior dormitories, which are now in use. In the same year the Rev. Father Beaudoin, with the assistance of the Rev. Doctor Fanning and the Hon. M. C. Quinn, of Peoria, obtained from the Illinois Legislature a university charter for the college. Many improvements, such as water-works, steam-heating apparatus, etc., were also introduced, which gave to the college more comfort and attractiveness.

During these years Father Roy and the able associates he had called to his assistance toiled on incessantly, and succeeded in establishing for St. Viateur's the excellent reputation it has ever since enjoyed. Among his worthy helpers were the Rev. M. J. Marsile, C. S. V., now president of the University; Rev. Anthony Mainville, C. S. V., for many years prefect of studies, and Brother J. B. Bernard, C. S. V. It was at the cost of most ceaseless toil, of personal sacrifices and constant vigilance on the part of these devoted men

that the institution flourished and made itself deservedly popular far and near. The result of these long years of labor and hardship began to tell upon the robust constitution of the tireless Father Roy, and he finally found himself incapable of serving any longer the institution in which his whole heart and soul were wrapt. He was recalled to Joliette, Canada, in the hope that a much-needed rest and the air of his own country would restore his health, but he died July 16, 1879. The name of one who had devoted his life's best energies to the education of youth was not forgotten by those who had enjoyed the benefits of his direction. The old students took steps, in 1888, for the erection of a monument to his revered memory. It was thought by the majority of those who met in Chicago for that purpose, that a chapel built in his honor would be the most suitable offering that could be made, and steps were taken by a committee to arrange a meeting of the old students and unfold the plan to them. Pursuant to their request, a large number of the former students assembled in the college hall, June 25, 1888, and a regular alumni association was formed. Subscriptions were paid up by members, and a sufficient amount was secured to enable the faculty to begin work on the new building. In March, 1889, the first ground was broken, and some months later work was begun on the chapel, which will stand as a monument to Father Roy's zeal in the work of education and as a worthy tribute of love from his former pupils.

The Rev. M. J. Marsile, C. S. V., succeeded Father Roy as president of the College, in 1879, and it is but justice to say that he has proved in every way a worthy successor to the lamented first president of the college. He is a native of Longueuil, near Montreal, and was educated in the community of St. Viateur's, where he pursued both his literary and theological courses, finishing these latter studies at St. Viateur's College, in Bourbonnais, under the first president. He was ordained in 1875, and occupied for many years the chair of French literature; afterward he became instructor in moral philosophy. He is a man of superior culture and acknowledged literary ability, having been for a long period

a contributor to the best magazines of Canada and the United States. In 1890, Rev. Father Marsile published two volumes of poetry, entitled "Epines et Fleurs," and "Liola," a metrical romance, which have been favorably received for their literary merit and poetic beauty. Recently he has written a classic drama in French verse, "Les Enfants de Clodomir," the repeated performances of which have been much applauded.

Soon the higher course of this new institution began to equip young men for theological studies, and immediately a theological department was attached to the already flourishing commercial and classical courses. While the collegiate courses were in process of evolution, there sprang up to complete them the special studies in higher literary criticism, the scientific department, and the various military, athletic, musical and dramatic associations, which are the usual external signs of healthy development. Nor were the superiors slow to adopt methods calculated to improve the courses of philosophy and theology designed chiefly for the promotion of the members of their community to sacred Orders. Not satisfied with the merely indispensable, they imparted to these courses the thoroughness and finish which the education of the American priest and religious demands. Accordingly we find upon the earliest roll of professors in these important branches men of decided ability, such as were the Rev. F. Flanagan, Dr. Madden, and Dr. Péborde. But the notable increase of students in the departments of philosophy and theology in recent years has necessitated the providing of professors who make a specialty of the branches assigned them. Thus, in the department of philosophy, Dr. E. L. Rivard, C.S.V., who took degrees of philosophy and theology in Rome, instructs his students in mental philosophy, in the history of philosophy and in oratory; Dr. J. Laberge (of Laval University) instructs the same students in the philosophy of history and in political economy; Dr. Morel teaches them physical sciences and mathematics, and the Rev. T. J. McCormick, C.S.V., gives them a special course in literary criticism. The text-books placed in the hands of

the students are standard works of well known excellence. In the theological department, the work is so divided as to leave each professor ample time to do full justice to the subjects treated. The Rev. J. Laberge, D.D. is the instructor in dogmatic theology, which is taught from the recent work of Tanqueray, with St. Thomas and the commentaries as books of reference. Five hours a week are given to classes in dogma. Once a week there are classes in Sacred Scripture, in canon law, liturgy and ecclesiastical history. The lectures on moral theology, five hours a week, are given by the Rev. Dr. G. M. Legris, who spent three years and a half in Rome under the tutelage of the eminent scholar, Satolli. The manual followed by the class is Sabetti, with Lehmkuhl, St. Alphonsus, and Gury as books of reference. The Rev. G. M. Legris also lectures once a week on ecclesiastical history. Sacred eloquence is taught once a week by Dr. Laberge, and Sacred Chant also once a week by the Rev. J. A. Desjardins, C.S.V.

A MISUNDERSTOOD TEXT:

"Be ye, therefore, perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect."—*Matt. v., 48.*

AND A PROPOSED NEW TRANSLATION OF IT:

"Be ye, therefore, catholic (in your love) as also your heavenly Father is catholic."

We often hear explanations of this text and allusions to it in sermons, we read them in theological and ascetical books and commentaries, but it is safe to say that in most cases the explanation or allusion indicates a misunderstanding of this text.

The common use of the word *perfect* as an ascetical term makes us at times forget its generic meaning and its varied applications.

"Perfect" and "imperfect" stand in the same relation to each other as do "whole" and "part." A perfect book, for example, is a whole or complete book, one that has all its pages; an imperfect book is a partial or incomplete book, one from which some of its pages are missing.

A man's love of his neighbor is perfect, *in its extension*, if it takes in all men and excludes no one, if it is unrestricted, that is to say, *catholic.*

The Latin word *perfectus* is not always translated into English by our word "perfect." Let me give some examples in which the word *perfectus* in the Vulgate is rightly translated in English, *finished*, *made ready*, *one*, *united*, *men.*

Gen. ii., I., Igitur *perfecti* sunt coeli et terrae.
So the heavens and the earth were *finished.* (Douay vers.)

III. Reg. vi., 7, De lapidibus dolatis atque *perfectis* aedificata est.
Was built of stones hewed and *made ready.* (Douay).

I. Par. xii., 38, *Corde perfecto* venerunt in Hebron.
The men of war came with *one heart* to Hebron, to make David king.

I. Cor. i., 10, Ut . . sitis autem *perfecti* in eodem sensu.
Perfect here means *united.*

I. Cor. xiv., 20, Sensibus autem *perfecti* estote.
In understanding be *men.* (King James vers.)

The word *perfectus*, which we are considering in our text, St. Matt., v., 48, is our Vulgate translation of the Greek word τελειος, but in St. Luke, xiii, 32, where we have the same word in its verbal form τελειοῦμαι, the Vulgate translates it *consummor*, and our Douay version, *I am consummated.*

Neither the Vulgate nor any other version invariably translates τελειος by perfect, nor will any translator from the Vulgate always translate *perfectus* by the English word "perfect,"

unless he is more anxious about the sound than the sense. It is not unprecedented, therefore, to propose another word for its translation. The common translation is not clear nor easily understood; in fact, it cannot be understood at all independently of its context, and even when read with this context, the word "perfect" in the majority of cases, misleads the reader.

Let me prove that the rendering of our text:

> "Be ye, therefore, *catholic* (in your love)
> as also your heavenly Father is *catholic*,"

is not only its correct meaning, but is the clearest and best English translation of it. I shall then give some of the doubtful, incorrect and false explanations of the text that have arisen from misunderstanding the meaning rightly attached to the word "perfect," as here used.

1. Taking the text as we find it in our English translations, let us suppose that we do not know what it means, or what meaning the word "perfect" has here. How do we find out its true meaning?

The first word that attracts our attention is the word *therefore*. This word usually introduces the conclusion of an argument, and so it does here. Most commentators agree that this text is not an independent exhortation inserted at random, without any special connection with what precedes, but that it logically follows from what has gone before. To understand, therefore, the meaning of our text, we must look into the premises from which this conclusion, our text, is deduced. The five verses that precede our text contain our premises; these I give here with their conclusion, so that we may have the whole argument before our eyes.

"You have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thy enemy. But I say to you, Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you.

"That you may be the children of your Father, who is in heaven, who maketh His sun to rise upon the good and the bad, and raineth upon the just and the unjust.

"For if you love them that love you, what reward shall you have? Do not even the publicans this? And if you salute your brethren only, what do you more? Do not also the heathens this? "Be ye, therefore, ... as also your heavenly Father is . . . . ." (Matt., v. 43–48.)

Remembering that a conclusion is drawn from its premises, and that the conclusion cannot contain anything that is not found in the premises, I direct the reader's attention to the following facts:

There is only *one* topic treated in these premises, that is, *the extent of our love of our neighbor*, therefore our conclusion cannot refer to anything else except the extent of our love of our neighbor. Christ corrects the error of his hearers who thought that God had commanded them to love those bound to them by ties of race, religion, blood and friendship, but not their heathen enemies; Christ insists that these are also their neighbors, and commands that love be also extended to them. He proves that they must love their enemies, and for this purpose He uses a two-fold argument, and concludes with an exhortation to do so.

"You have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thy enemy."

This was the way in which some of the Jewish teachers interpreted the law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor," in Leviticus, xix., 18. They restricted the meaning of the word neighbor; by it they meant those of their own race. They said the Gentiles were not their neighbors, these they were not commanded to love; it was natural and proper that they should hate them. Christ rejects their misinterpretation of the law and insists that their enemies must also be included in the extent of their love. "I say to you, love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you." This command Christ enforces by the two following arguments which, besides implying the foundation of this universal love, which includes even our enemies, are also the two strongest arguments *ad hominem* that could be addressed to the Jews, and

arguments which those who opposed Christ did not attempt to answer. The Jews took great pride in calling themselves the children of God. "*We have one Father, even God.*" (Jo. viii., 42.) And the greatest insult that could be offered to a Jew would be to call him a heathen or a publican. The first argument contained in the texts quoted above may be put in this form :

"God is not your Father, and you are not His children unless you are like Him.

"But you are not like Him, unless you love all men, your enemies as well as your friends, for He loves and does good to all ; for example, He sends down His sun and His rain on the fields of the bad as well as the good, giving to both a fruitful harvest.

"Therefore, if God is your Father and you are His children, you must love all men, your enemies as well as your friends."

The heathens and the publicans, on the contrary, as far as love and kind acts are concerned, make a distinction between their friends and their enemies; the former they love, the latter they hate. The second argument may be put as follows :

"If you love your neighbor and keep the law of Leviticus only as the heathens do, you are no better than they are.

"But to love only your friends and to hate your enemies is to keep this law as the heathens do.

"Therefore, if you do not love your enemies, you are no better than the heathens."

Summing up these two contrasted arguments, we have : Be ye therefore not restricted in your love of men like the heathen, but catholic in your love like your heavenly Father. There are two conclusions : Be like your heavenly Father, loving all men, and, Be not like the heathen. One is expressed : Be like your heavenly Father ; the other : Be not like the heathen, is implied and is sufficiently understood. It would not be proper to give too much prominence to it, for those heathens whom we should not imitate, we must, however, include in the extent of our love.

The meaning of the conclusion "Be ye, therefore, catholic in your love," is just the same as the meaning of the

divine command, "Love your enemies," which precedes the argument, and they both are answers to the question: Who is my neighbor? He is every man on earth. The duty of loving all men, except our enemies, was admitted by all our Savior's hearers, all that was necessary was to teach them that our enemies are also our neighbors, and that the commandment "Love your neighbor," is not fulfilled, unless our love is catholic, or co-extensive with the human race. There is only *one* thought that our Savior wishes to impress on his hearers' minds, only *one* duty that He here insists on, and that is the extension of their love to their fellow-men; in its extension it must be universal or catholic; no one can be excluded from it. The classical Latin and Greek had no word to express this thought, and hence the want of clearness in our text, even in the original. The term "catholic," now so common, is the only word that exactly expresses this thought; it is, therefore, the only proper word to use here in translating τελειος, *perfectus* into English. "Be ye, therefore, catholic (in your love)," is, therefore, the clearest and best translation of this text. The words "in your love" are understood; I think that it is better to express them so as to make the text as clear as possible.

How would it do, the reader may ask, to express these words and insert them in the common translation, so as to make it read, "Be ye, therefore, perfect (in your love), as, also, your heavenly Father is perfect"? It would not do at all. The idea of loving our neighbor as perfectly as God does (for that is what this translation would mean) is not admissible. There is no question here about the perfection or intensity of our love, in which there are many grades, but solely about its extension. Our love of our follow-men should be co-extensive with God's love of them, *i. e.*, we must exclude no one from our good wishes and good offices that God does not exclude.

"Diligentissime distinguenda esse quae sunt de *praecepto* charitatis et quae sunt de *perfectione* charitatis." (Ballerini, Vol. II., p. 115). If the word "perfect" is to be retained, the text to be clear should read: Be ye, therefore, perfect (in

the extent of the love of your neighbor), as, also, your heavenly Father is perfect; but, there is nothing in such a translation to recommend it. "Catholic" means *perfect in extension*, all embracing, world-wide. Substituting this one clear, exact word for three, our text will, and should read: Be ye, therefore, catholic (in your love) as your heavenly Father is catholic.

2. Examples are not wanting to show how misleading has been the word *perfect* in this text. The common translation may suit a pantheist very well. "Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father," are words which coincide with his views, for taking the words as they stand, "Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father," or Be as perfect as God, mean nothing if we cannot be as perfect as God. The common translation is agreeable, also, to those (Ballerini IV., p. 3) who deny the Catholic doctrine that there is any distinction between counsels and commandments. If we are commanded to be as perfect as God, in as far as that is possible, there seems to be left no room for counsels, and our text becomes a weapon against the Catholic doctrine. But passing by the mistakes of pantheists, and those who are opposed to the teaching of the Church, let us consider only the incoherent and contradictory manner in which this text has been handled by Catholic interpreters. The great variety of existing explanations show that this text must have been a puzzle to commentators, and if taken in any other sense than as the logical conclusion of the texts which immediately precede it, we need not wonder that it should prove a puzzle never to be solved. We will take each word by itself and see how it has been treated in various works, such as happen to be at hand. It may not be out of place to remind the reader that our Savior says *your* heavenly Father, not *my* heavenly Father. He is speaking in what precedes, not of the love of One Divine Person for men, but of the love of the whole Blessed Trinity. God's goodness in sending us the rain and sunshine is an act *ad extra*, an act of the Three Divine Persons. To prevent any one from being distracted by wondering whether *heavenly Father* refers to the First Person only, or to all

Three, let me substitute *God* for heavenly Father, as we sometimes interchange identical things in Algebra, the sense, of course, remaining the same. There are four words or phrases to be examined: *Be ye*, *therefore*, *perfect*, *as God is perfect.*

BE YE:—Cornelius a Lapide says:[1] The emphasis here (in this text) is on the word "*ye.*" If *ye* is emphasized so as to distinguish *ye* from the rest of men, then this exhortation is addressed to some but not to all men? However, whether *ye* is emphasized or not, does not matter at present.

THEREFORE:—A Lapide says: "The word *therefore* refers partly to what immediately precedes . . . But *therefore* also refers to all that has gone before." We have seen that *therefore* refers to what immediately precedes and to nothing else, and that the conclusion from what immediately precedes is: Be catholic (in your love) as God your heavenly Father is. How does A Lapide attempt to prove that our text must be stretched so as to become a conclusion for all that has gone before? He makes no attempt to prove, but contents himself with merely asserting it. *Quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur.*

However, let us see if what he asserts is probable. Supplying what has gone before we have "Be ye perfect (*i. e.*, Be poor and meek, mourn, love persecution, etc., do not kill, be not angry, do not commit adultery, etc.), as your heavenly Father is perfect (*i. e.*, He is poor, is meek, He mourns, loves persecution, does not kill, does not get angry, etc.). This will not stand.

Knabenbauer, Matt. I., p. 244, says: "perfectionem istam *proxime referri* ad dilectionem inimicis exhibendam, *proin* ad perfectionem in amore patet ex contextu et asseritur recte a plerisque." This is an improvement on A Lapide, but it is not correct. What he says in the first sentence is true, but not so what he states in the second. The perfection spoken of in our text refers not only proximately but exclusively to the love of our enemies.

1 Eng. trans., Matt. I, p. 243.

Coleridge (The Public Life of Our Lord, Serm. on the Mount, III., p. 187) manages to avoid the difficulty by supposing that our text is an independent exhortation inserted in the Sermon on the Mount. "Thus," he writes, "we may consider that He pauses for a moment at this stage of His Sermon, to urge us in these burning words to endeavor to imitate God in all things, and not only in that particular virtue of clemency and love of enemies of which He has been speaking." But there is surely no warrant for this assumption, and most of us in explaining the text will hold that our Lord still refers to that particular virtue of which He has been speaking.

Ballerini, or rather his editor, Palmieri, comes nearer to what we assume to be the correct interpretation of this text, inasmuch as he considers it a conclusion from what proximately precedes.

PERFECT:—This word is the great stumbling-block, and the source of much misinterpretation. Are these words *Be perfect* a command or a counsel? St. Thomas (2a, 2ae, q. 184, art. 2 sed contra) says they are a commandment. "*Lex* divina non inducit ad impossibile. Inducit autem ad perfectionem, secundum illud Matt. v., 48, 'Estote perfecti sicut et pater vester coelestis perfectus est.'" And in Art. 3 sed contra he writes: "Ergo videtur quod perfectio consistit in observantia *praeceptorum*."

Ballerini (vide infra) also takes these words as a commandment. We have already shown that, rightly understood and translated, they are a commandment.

Others take this text as a counsel, although the wording is certainly against them. See Coleridge, l. c.—Kenelm Vaughan, Divine Armory of S. Scripture, p. 225.—Maldonatus, p. 183, Eng. Vers. S. Matt. vol. I. "Christ proposes a mark which He knows we cannot attain."—Rodriguez, Practice of Christian and Religious Perfection, I. Treatise I. Chap. 8. "To aim at the highest things is very conducive to the attainment of perfection. He (Christ) exhorts us to perfection in these words, Be ye therefore perfect as your heavenly Father."—Knabenbauer, Commentarius in Ev.

sec. S. Matth. vol. I. p. 245.—IV. Council of Lateran (Denziger, Ench. No. 248), "quemadmodum Veritas ait: Estote perfecti, sicut et Pater vester coelestis perfectus est, ac si diceret manifestius: Estote perfecti perfectione gratiae, sicut Pater vester coelestis perfectus est perfectione naturae utraque videlicet suo modo." The Abbot Joachim wrote a book against Peter Lombard in which, attempting to explain the mystery of the Holy Trinity, he proposes an absurd quaternity in God. The Council wrote a decree condemning this book in which decree the words quoted occur.

Although the Council in formulating a dogmatic decision is guided by the infallible voice of the Holy Ghost, this assistance does not affect the grammatical construction, the exact quotation of texts (*e. g.*, the word *therefore* is here omitted), the best selection and the correct application of texts used as illustrations; all of which things are accidental to the organs through which dogmatic truth is declared, and they vary according to the erudition, attention and labor of the committee by whom the decree is formulated.

A Lapide, in attempting to explain the words, "be perfect," adopts a *via media;* he does not say that these words are a command or a council, but that they are *both!* "You will ask whether this perfection be of counsel or of precept? I reply, partly of counsel, partly of precept." This is evading the difficulty.

AS GOD IS PERFECT.—This comparison is the "crux" of the commentators, and, taking the word "perfect" as it is commonly understood by them, we need not wonder. "Be perfect as God," is hardly orthodox. Let us see how Maldonatus, p. 183, tries to get out of the difficulty. "The word *as* contains the meaning, not of equality (aequalitatem), but of quality (qualitatem) and resemblance, that similitude which *can* exist between God and man, not between man and man . . . Christ proposes a mark to us which He knows that we *cannot* attain."

This explanation of Maldonatus seems to the commentators to be the best that could be invented, so they all accept

it. But it does not solve the difficulty; it offers us a distinction instead of a solution, a distinction which is but a clever avoidance of the difficulty. The distinction of *aequalitatem* and *qualitatem* is altogether arbitrary, nor does it squarely meet the difficulty. Be ye like God, is just as bad as, Be ye as great as God; we find the same words ascribed to Lucifer, who, in his pride, rebels against God: "*I will be like to the Most High.*" (Is. xiv., 14). In the translation I have given no such distinctions are required; *as* is taken in its ordinary meaning; it means here *eqality;* Be ye *equal to God* in the extent of your love (*i. e.*, negatively), excluding no one from it whom God does not exclude.

In the quotation given it appears, moreover, that Maldontus contradicts himself: First he states that there is question here of that similitude which *can* exist between God and man (a), and then he says that Christ (b) here "proposes a mark to us which he knows we *cannot* attain," *i. e.*, He proposes to us something, exhorts us to do something, which is impossible. Let us compare this last solution of Maldonatus with St. Thomas (2a, 2ae, Q. 184, art. 2, sed contra.).

Lex divina non inducit ad impossibile; inducit autem ad perfectionem secundum illud Matt., "Estote perfecti, sicut pater vester coelestis perfectus est:" Ergo; videtur quod aliquis in hac vita *possit esse perfectus.*

The Revised Protestant Version also offers us a new translation, making the text a mere statement instead of a command or an exhortation: "*Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.*" This change of tense has nothing to justify it, the context is against it, and, besides, it does not remove that troublesome comparison. To say that we can be perfect as God, whether here or hereafter is equally heterodox. The words of the Revised Version, not only as to the sense but as to mood, tense and form, recall the words used by the serpent in tempting Eve. In fact, the change made by the Protestant revisers in the passage of Genesis, iii., 5, by substituting *God* for *Gods* completes the parallel, for if

we understand "God" for "your heavenly Father" in S. Matt., we have the parallel in sound as well as in sense :

Gen. iii., 5: *The Serpent:* Ye shall be as God (R. V.)

Matt. v., 48: *The Rev. Ver:* Ye therefore shall be perfect as (God.)

Of the three common translations, the Douay, the King James and the Revised Version, the last mentioned is surely the worst translatiton.

It is plain, then, that if we take the word *perfect* in a general sense, without attending to the fact that our text is a conclusion from what immediately precedes, we are led into an absurd interpretation. Again, putting the emphasis on the *ye*, making *therefore* refer partly to one thing and partly to some other things, making *perfect* a command or a counsel or both, making a distinction to avoid the comparison between ourselves and God expressed by the word *as*, changing the mood and tense of the verb and making it a *statement* instead of a command or an exhortation,—these are all very clever, but they are not satisfactory, they do not explain the text, but leave it as it is, when not rightly understood, *male sonans.*

In conclusion, let me again refer to Ballerini's exposition of this text. It is probably the most satisfactory among those which I have cited. I italicize the portion which might stand, but the rest is open to criticism. The word "perfect" tests his judgment and prevents him from giving a clear explanation of the text. (Vol. IV., p. 5.)

"*Verba Domini*, Matt. v., 48, *non de perfectione generatim loquuntur, sed de* ea quae sita est in *dilectione inimicorum, quam Christus praecepit v. 44.: ut sitis, inquit filii Patris vestri, qui in coelis est, qui solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos, etc.*

Hujus paternae dilectionis in imitationem Dom. praecepit ut simus similes Patri: et quia haec est perfectio, *concludit: estote ergo perfecti in hac re, sicut Pater vester coelestis perfectus est:* similitudinem commendans, non aequalitatem neque ullum gradum similitudinis determinans, sed *solum id exigens ut diligamus inimicos eisque bene faciamus.*

Our text does not comment on perfection in general, nor on the perfection of any virtue in particular: there is no question here about the perfect love of our enemies; Christ neither here nor anywhere else *commanded* the *perfect love* of our enemies; what He commands here is the *perfect extension of the love of our neighbor* so as to include also our enemies. Let us read over our premises again and remember our Logic. There is nothing in the premises about *how much* God loves, or how much any one else loves; the only thing we can find there is *how many* God loves, and how many the heathen loves, and how many we must love, and then follows an exhortation to identify ourselves with God, and not with the heathen in the extent of our love.

I have already noticed the translation of the Revised Version to show how it has changed the sense of the text in an altogether arbitrary manner, without anything in what precedes or follows to justify it. The other two common translations, the King James and the Douay, are identical in sense, but since their wording is different they may be compared from a literary standpoint. The Vulgate has *et* in the text which is not found in the Greek. Our Douay, following the Vulgate, translates it by *also*. The King James version here also follows the Vulgate and translates "et" by *even*. Here are the two versions:

King James: Be ye therefore perfect, *even* as your Father *which is in heaven* is perfect.

Douay: Be ye therefore perfect, as *also* your *heavenly* Father is perfect.

The King James has "Father *which is in heaven.*" Probably the translators of the King James version thought it well to insert here the same phrase that occurs in the preface of the Lord's prayer; however, it is a sample of bad translating, because the Greek phrases in the two cases are different. Moreover, it is an offence against the "economy of attention" to use several words where one will equally well express the thought. It is needless to add that *which* instead of *who* is now obsolete. The Douay is evidently from a literary point of view a much better translation of

this text than the King James, but it can be improved both in sound and sense, and the translation I have offered is, I venture to believe, an improvement. Here are three varieties of it, any one of which is better than the three common translations that we have been considering:

(1) Be ye, therefore, catholic (in your love), as also your heavenly Father is catholic.

In English, if we say "*He is good as gold*," our meaning is clear enough; but, if we say "*He is as good as gold*," the sentence is more perfectly balanced, and is more pleasing to the mind and to the ear; for this reason some may prefer to write the word *as*, which is understood, before "perfect," so as to have a fuller and clearer expression of the comparison which is contained in the text. Then we have: (2) Be ye, therefore, *as* catholic (in your love) as also your heavenly Father is catholic.

It is not necessary in English, and it is not customary to twice express the quality common to the two things which are compared; *e. g.*, we do not say: He is as good as gold *is good;* we omit the second *good* and say: He is as good as gold. For the same reason our text would be more concise and more pleasing to English ears if we expressed the word catholic only once, as that is the term according to which God and ourselves are compared and identified. *Also* adds nothing to the sense, and in a free translation may be omitted. We shall then have:

(3) Be ye, therefore, as catholic (in your love) as your heavenly Father.

Many other varieties might be proposed (it is hard to find two translators who will agree on the same form of words), any of which will do, if the meaning conveyed by them is "Be as catholic as God," *and not* "Be as perfect as God."

In no part of the Scriptures is the whole doctrine of the love of our neighbor, and especially of our enemies, so clearly and so completely expressed as here (Matt. v., 43–48). Two subjects are treated which works on Theology develop at length, *whom* we must love, and *how* we must love them.

Whom must we love? All men, even our enemies; our love must be co-extensive with God's (*i. e.*, negatively), no one must be excluded from it.

How must we love? What marks of love must be shown to all men, even to our enemies? Are all to be loved equally? Certainly not. God does not love all equally. He does not love the wicked as much as the good. He does not shower His grace equally on all. *Common* marks of love are due to all, and this is beautifully illustrated by the rain and the sunshine which God gives to all, good and bad, alike.

St. Anthony when a young man while at church one day heard the priest read the words of the Gospel, "Go sell what thou hast and give to the poor and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." These words made such an impression on him that as soon as he went home he gave away all his wealth, keeping only what little he thought absolutely necessary. The next day he heard the words of the Sermon on the Mount, "Be not solicitous for to-morrow." These words moved him as powerfully as the others and he gave away what little he had retained, renouncing all creatures and putting all his trust in God. Such was the influence of the divine counsel in the words of Holy Writ. We have no record of anyone who was moved by the words "Be ye therefore perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect." Why? Because the words of Holy Writ are not "more piercing than any two-edged sword," unless they are rightly understood. Understanding these words as an exhortation to something "which Christ knows we cannot attain" we cannot expect to be moved, though we might be discouraged; moreover, they are too general and indefinite in their common translation, *generalia non pungunt:* but rightly rendered and understood they clearly and forcibly express and impose upon us an obligation of love for all men. In this sense they truly become words "living and effectual and more piercing than any two-edged sword." (Heb. iv., 12.)

JOSEPH F. SHEAHAN.

ANALECTA.

E S. R. UNIV. INQUISITIONE.

I.

TRADITIO INSTRUMENTORUM ET IMPOSITIO MANUUM IN S. ORDINATIONE.

Dubium.

R. P. D. Episcopus N. N. sequentia exposuit:

N. N. Sacerdos dubitat de validitate suae Ordinationis ob sequentes rationes:

1. Episcopus ordinans, dum calicem cum patena, vino et hostia ordinandis traderet et formam Pont. Rom. proferret, *forsan* ipsa instrumenta non tangebat, quamquam, ante eum genuflexi, interim candidati tangerent, aliquo modo clerico ea sustentante.

2. Ipse N. N. ordinatus, post primam manuum impositionem, ab altari, ut alii sex ordinandi bini et bini accederent impositionem huiusmodi accepturi, secessit, spatio circiter trium metrorum, ibi scamno innitens genuflexus institit, *fortassis* seiunctus ab aliis ordinandis, qui erant propius altari, nec ad altare accessit cum Episcopus et Sacerdotes secundam dexterae manus agerent impositionem, quae est de essentia Ordinationis.

Dignetur Em. V. rescribere mihi an Sacerdos sic ordinatus rursus ordinationem *sub conditione* suscipere teneatur, vel imponi ei possit ut conscientiae tranquillitatem resumat, tum quia traditio instrumentorum *probabilius* non est de essentia Ordinationis, tum quia dum Episcopus et Sacerdotes manum extensam tenerent, in secunda impositione, ipse ordinatus moraliter vicinus seu aliis unitus et physice praesens erat, in ipso Presbyterio, seu Sanctis Sanctorum, quamquam, ut supra ab altari distans.

Quibus dubiis ad examen sedulo vocatis, in Congregatione Generali habita feria IV. die 2 Decembris 1896, Emi ac Rmi Domini Cardinales Inquisitores Generales, praehabito voto DD. Consultorum, respondendum mandarunt:

Ad utrumque: *Adquiescat.*

Sequenti vero feria VI. die 4 eiusdem mensis, SSmus D. N. Leo divina providentia Papa XIII., in solita audientia r. p. d. Adsessori impertita, relatam Sibi Emorum Patrum resolutionem benigne adprobare et confirmare dignatus est.

I. CAN. MANCINI, *S. R. et U. I. Notarius.*

II.

ORDINATIO DIACONI ITERANDA SUB CONDITIONE.

Dubium.

Italus quidam Episcopus Sacrae Congregationi S. Officii humiliter exponit, quod cum annis abhinc circiter quatuor, optimo cuidam suae Dioecesis subdiacono Diaconatus ordinem conferre vellet, in illius ordinatione peragenda manum utique dexteram, et ad minimam quidem distantiam, super caput eius suspendit, quin tamen praedictum illius caput *corporaliter* attingeret. Cumque mox hic defectus haud essentialis praedicto Episcopo, aliisque ecclesiasticis viris ab eodem consultis visus fuerit, eumdem clericum non ita multo post ad sacerdotalem ordinem promovit, quem ipse clericus a tribus iam annis laudabiliter exercet. Verum illius defectus recordatio magnam nunc eidem Episcopo anxietatem et de praedictae diaconalis ordinationis validitate dubitationem affert. Eapropter ipse Revmis EE. VV. duo haec dubia reverenter proponit, videlicet:

I. An ad reparandum praedictae ordinationis defectum ordinatio tota diaconatus in illo sacerdote *sub conditione* iterari debeat.—Et quatenus affirmative:

II. An haec ordinationis iteratio *sub conditione* fieri possit a quocumque catholico Episcopo secreto, quocumque anni tempore, etiam in sacello privato, uti responsum est in quodam Rescripto Congregationis S. Officii, die 28 Ianuarii anno

1835, ad reparandum quemdam defectum impositionis manuum, qui in Ordinationem cuiusdam presbyteri irrepserat.

S. C., mature examinato casu, in feria IV., 20 Ianuarii 1875, rescripsit: "Ad utrumque affirmative, facto verbo cum SSmo.—Eadem feria ac die SSmus EE. DD. resolutionem confirmavit, ac facultates omnes necessarias et opportunas impertiri dignatus est."

III.

DISPENSATIO AB INTERPELLATIONIBUS, ET USUS PRIVILEGII PAULINI.

Beatissime Pater,—Quaedam mahumetana, ante duos annos cum sua prole (puella) facta est catholica. Maria nomen in baptismate suscepit, cognomine B. desiderat modo matrimonium inire cum aliquo catholico. Admonita a me, ut cum suo marito Suljo B., qui mansit in infidelitate nec vult converti, cohabitaret, renuit id facere ex metu, qui nescio an sit sufficiens ad solvendum naturalis matrimonii vinculum ex privilegio S. Pauli.

Iussus Suljo ad me venire, interrogavi illum coram Maria, velitne cum eadem cohabitare sine contumelia Conditoris et promittere ut utriusque sexus proles catholicae evadant, respondit affirmative.

Reliqui eos solos per aliquod temporis spatium. Postea venit ad me Maria et dixit mihi se nolle cum Suljo cohabitare et velle transire ad alias nuptias cum catholico, vel malle potius innuptam manere quam cum suo infideli marito vivere.

Maria accepit a suo avunculo, bene stante mahumetano, literas, quas ego ipse legi et quibus illi avunculus promittit pecuniam, se et domum quam ex pluribus vellet empturum, si iterum redeat ad mahumetanismum. Dixit ergo mihi Maria: "Putasne tu hoc factum esse sine mei mariti consensu? Deinde maritus meus dolore afficitur, quod mihi non fregerit costam aliquam et me inhabilem non fecerit ita ut nec Deus nec diabolus me velit."

Quando ergo illi conabar difficultates solvere et spem forsan adesse dixi ut Suljo convertatur, respondit, eum nequaquam

nostram religionem amplexurum esse, atque addidit: "Velles tu vel una nocte cum Suljo in eodem cubiculo pernoctare?"— Et quando ego respondi negative, dixit mihi: "Quare ergo me cogis ut ego cum illo cohabitem et vitam ducam?"

Si quis me interrogaret in genere, ut dicerem obiective, an mahumetanis credendum sit, quando dicunt se velle pacifice cohabitare cum sua uxore conversa, responderem tuta conscientia non esse credendum. Si autem me quis interrogaret de Suljo, deberem respondere, talem impressionem eum facere ac si veritatem diceret; attentis tamen omnibus quae Maria dixit, forsan posset affirmari non esse sperandam pacificam cohabitationem.

Quando agebatur de Mariae conversione, tunc putabam necessarium consilium ei dare, ut interim pergat ad maritum suum, donec ibi mediantibus catholicis feminis bene instruatur et imbuatur doctrina catholica. Ast illa mihi respondit: "Ecce tu es vir prudens, et quomodo potes mihi tale consilium dare? Si meus maritus amplexus esset catholicam fidem et ego manerem mahumetana, ego interficerem illum; quomodo ergo pergerem ad illum et me vitae periculo exponerem?"

Addo saepius accidisse ante Bosniae occupationem, ut a parentibus et cognatis mahumetana occideretur, quando amplexa est religionem catholicam.

Hinc quum Maria in peccati periculo versetur, Beatitudinem Vestram supplex rogo ut aut vi privilegii Paulini, aut suprema potestate, si causae separationis a coniuge infideli non censeantur sufficientes, vinculum matrimonii inter Mariam et Suljo B. quantocius solvere dignetur.

Sacros pedes exosculans summa qua par est reverentia permaneo,

Beatitudinis Vestrae indignus filius,

Seraievi, die 16 Oct. 1894.

† Josephus.

Beatissime Pater: Archiepiscopus Seraieven. et Vhrbosnen. ad pedes Sanctitatis Tuae provolutus exponit:

Maria B., mulier quaedem ex mahumetana religione duobus abhinc annis ad fidem catholicam conversa, cupit cum aliquo

viro catholico novum matrimonium inire, relicto iam suo priore marito Suljo B., infideli ac renuente converti. Quamvis enim iste adfirmaverit, se velle cum eadem habitare sine contumelia Creatoris prolemque utriusque sexus in catholica religione educare, mulier tamen e contra persuasa est de mala ac subdola eiusdem intentione, hanc arguens tum ex quibusdam literis proprii avunculi, qui eam allicit ad mahumetism umiterum amplectendum, forsan non sine consensu ipsius Sulji, tum ex eo quod hic manifestavit desiderium male eam habendi, tum ex eo quod mahumetani maximo odio prosequuntur mulieres ad christianam fidem conversas, quae proinde a parentibus et cognatis quandoque occiduntur.

Quapropter Archiepiscopus orator humiliter rogat, ut Sanctitas Tua vi aut privilegii Paulini aut supremae suae potestatis, vinculum matrimonii inter Mariam et Suljo B. quantocius solvere dignetur.

Feria IV., die 28 Novembris, 1894.

In Congregatione generali S. R. et Universalis Inquisitionis, examinato suprascripto supplici libello ac perpensis omnibus tum iuris tum facti momentis, praehabitoque DD. Consultorum voto, Emi ac Rmi DD. Cardinales Inquisitores Generales in rebus fidei et morum decreverunt:

Supplicandum SSmo pro dispensatione ab ulteriore interpellatione et mulier utatur privilegio Paulino.

Feria V. die 29 dicti mensis, facta de his omnibus relatione SSmo D. N. Leoni Papae XIII., eadem Sanctitas Sua benigne annuit pro gratia iuxta Emorum Patrum suffragia.

I. MANCINI, *S. R. et U. I. Not.*

IV.

DISPENSATIO AD QUINQUENNIUM SUPER INTERPELLATIONE PAULINA.

Beatissime Pater:—Episcopus Vhrbosnen., ad pedes Sanctitatis Tuae humiliter provolutus exponit:

Puella quaedam mahumetana, quae declaravit se velle fieri catholicam, vi rapta est a mahumetanis et adducta est ad quemdam mahumetanum, cum quo illa contra suam volun-

tatem longiori tempore vivebat et prolem cum illo genuit. Postea aufugit ab illo simul cum prole ad catholicos et imbuta catholica religione suscepit sacramentum baptismatis.

Interrogata an cum mahumetano inierit matrimonium, respondit se quidem eum interpellasse atque rogasse, ut matrimonio iungerentur, eumque respondisse matrimonium iam initum esse ; ast patrio more a mahumetanis servato, matrimonium initum esse minime demonstrari potest. Iudex autem mahumetanus decrevit matrimonium de quo agitur nequaquam censendum esse qua initum secundum leges mahumetanas.

Quum autem non multum requiratur, ut matrimonium censeatur ut sit validum, quum mahumetana, licet initio contra propriam voluntatem, postea voluntarie vixerit cum mahumetano, quum mahumetanus affirmaverit se coram competentibus personis inivisse matrimonium cum absente mahumetana, hinc Episcopus orator postulat Sanctitatem Vestram ut Anna (quod nomen baptizata mahumetana accepit) dispensetur ab officio interpellandi mahumetanum, si revera matrimonium naturale inter eos consistat, utrum cohabitare velit absque contumelia Salvatoris, atque utendi privilegio Paulino.

Insuper Orator postulat pro se facultatem dispensandi cum quolibet mahumetano aut mahumetana, nec non cum iudaeo aut iudaea, quatenus non interrogata parte relicta in infidelitate, ut ad alias nuptias parti conversae liceat transire.

Feria VI., die 16 Augusti, 1895.

SSmus D. N. Leo divina providentia PP. XIII., in audientia R. P. D. Adsessori S. Officii impertita, audita relatione suprascripti supplicis libelli, praehabitoque DD. Consultorum voto necnon Emorum Patrum suffragio, benigne indulsit ut R. P. D. Archiepiscopus Vhrbosnen dispensare possit, quatenus opus est, puellam mahumetanam, de qua in precibus, ab interpellatione.

Insuper eadem Sanctitas Sua benigne concessit eidem Archiepiscopo facultatem dispensandi super interpellatione coniugum in infidelitate relictorum, pro omnibus casibus ordinariis, dummodo scilicet adhibitis antea omnibus dili-

gentiis, etiam per publicas ephemerides, ad reperiendum locum ubi coniux infidelis habitat, iisque in irritum cessis, constet saltem summarie et extraiudicialiter, coniugem absentem moneri legitime non posse, aut monitum infra tempus in monitione praefixum suam voluntatem non significasse. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Idque ad quinquennium.

I. MANCINI, Can. MAGNONI, *S. R. et U. I. Not.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

PERMITTI POTEST SORORIBUS VOTORUM SIMPLICIUM EX INSTITUTIS DIOECESANIS UT ASSISTANT PARENTES VEL FRATRES, IN CASU GRAVIS INFIRMITATIS.

Emi Patres:—Episcopus Maioricensis in Hispania Sacrae Episcoporum et Regularium Congregationi sequens reverenter exponit dubium :—An possit tolerari consuetudo adeundi in domo parentum vel fratrum, quam habent Sorores Tertiariae votorum simplicium sine clausura, quarum Constitutiones nondum sancitae fuerunt a Sede Apostolica, in casu gravis infirmitatis *illorum*, ad id ut eos assistant, et ibi *solae* remanere quamdiu infirmitas duraverit?

Dum ad hoc responsum praestolor, prospera vobis ex toto corde desidero. Obsequentissimus uti frater *Ep. Maioricen.* Palmae, 8 Augusti 1896.

Illustriss. atque adm. Revde. Domine uti frater:—Circa dubium quod Amplitudo Tua solvendum proponit huic S. Congregationi Episcoporum et Regularium : "Utrum scilicet tolerari possit consuetudo, quam habent Sorores Tertiariae votorum simplicium sine clausura, quarum Constitutiones nondum sancitae fuerunt a Sede Apostolica, adeundi parentes vel fratres in casu gravis infirmitatis illorum, ad hoc ut eos assistant, et apud illos solas remanere quamdiu infirmitas

duraverit;" eadem S. Congregatio respondendum censuit prout respondet:—Cum agatur de Instituto votorum simplicium dioecesano et sine clausura, consuetudo de qua in precibus, dependet a prudenti Ordinarii arbitrio, praescriptis tamen debitis cautelis. Haec a me significanda erant Amplitudini Tuae, cui omnia fausta feliciaque adprecor a Domino.

Romae 26 Augusti 1896.—Amplitudinis tuae—Uti frater

I. CARD. VERGA, *Praefectus.*

A. TROMBETTA, *Pro-Secret.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE PROPAGANDAE FIDEI.

I.

AN POSSINT BAPTIZARI FILII INFIDELIUM.

Ab Episcopo Kishnaghurensi, d. 28 Aug. 1886, dubia proposita sunt Sac. C. de Prop. Fide: quae, ad S. Officium transmissa, die 18 Julii 1892, demun tulerunt responsum a S. Pontifice approbatum:

1. "An possint baptizari filii infidelium, in periculo non vero in articulo mortis constituti?

2. "An iidem possint saltem baptizari, quando non est spes eos denuo revisendi?

3. "Quid si valde prudenter dubitetur, quod ex infirmitate, qua actu afficiuntur, non vivant, sed moriantur ante aetatem discretionis?

4. "An baptizari possint filii infidelium in periculo vel articulo mortis constituti, de quibus dubitatur, an attigerint statum discretionis, et non adest opportunitas eos docendi in rebus fidei?

Resp. ad 1, 2, 3. "Affirmative";

ad 4. "Conentur missionarii eos instruere eo meliori modo, quo fieri possit; secus baptizentur sub conditione."

II.

APPROBATIO CONCILII SECUNDI LEOPOLIENSIS RUTHENORUM.

Cum R. P. D. Sylvester Sembratowicz Archiepiscopus Leopoliensis Ruthenorum, et Episcopi eius Suffraganei ad celebrationem Synodi Provincialis secundae post Zamoscenam animum adiecerint, eadem Leopoli celebrata est anno 1891, die 24 Septembris indicta, die 8 Octobris feliciter absoluta, praesidente Delegato a Sancta Sede Apostolica R. P. D. Augustino Ciasca Archiepiscopo Larissae. Porro quum eiusdem Synodi acta ac Decreta R. P. D. Archiepiscopus aliique Praesules, eo quo par erat obsequio Sanctae Sedis examini iudicioque subiecerint, Emi Patres S. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide pro Negotiis Ritus Orientalis illa ad examen revocarunt, atque recognoverunt iuxta exemplar heic adnexum; in cuius recognitionis testimonium praesens Decretum edi mandarunt, ut ab omnibus ad quos pertinet fideliter observetur.

Quam S. Consessus sententiam cum subscriptus Secretarius SSmo D. N. Leoni PP. XIII. in audientia diei 30 Aprilis 1895 retulerit, SSmus Dominus in omnibus eam probare ratamque habere dignatus est, contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex aedibus eiusdem S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide pro Negotiis Ritus Orientalis, die 1. Maii anni 1895.

M. CARD. LEDOCHOWSKI, *Praef.*
A. VECCIA, *Secretarius.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

S. PETRUS CLAVER S. J., PATRONUS SACRARUM MISSIONUM AD NIGRITAS.

Quum Sanctus Petrus Claver, eximius Confessor e Societate Iesu, inter cetera ecclesiastici officii munia in exemplum gesta praeclare, Carthagenae sex et quadraginta annos Nigritis convertendis atque in catholica fide excolendis

praecipue intentus fuerit, non immerito tanquam eiusdem gentis Apostolus habetur. Constat praeterea quod etiam post obitum, Sanctus Confessor sacras expeditiones ad Nigritas miraculis illustraverit ac peculiaris patrocinii signis prosecutus fuerit. Quare postulatoriis epistolis quamplurimi ecclesiastici viri ac praesertim Sacrorum Antistites apud Nigritas constituti, sive in Africa, sive in America tam Meridionali quam Septentrionali, sive in Australia aliisque Orbis partibus disseminatos, praeeunte Rmo P. Ludovico Martin, Praeposito Generali Societatis Iesu, supplicarunt Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII., ut Suprema Auctoritate Sua Sanctum Petrum Claver declarare dignaretur Patronum peculiarem sacrarum expeditionum Nigritis ad Evangelii agnitionem traducendis, vel iam traductis in illius observantia continendis.

Porro eiusmodi preces Idem Sanctissimus Dominus Noster benigne excipiens, Congregationi Emorum et Rmorum Cardinalium Sacris tuendis Ritibus praepositorum, remisit, ut sententiam suam Sacer Amplissimus Ordo hac in re panderet. Sacra vero Congregatio in Ordinariis Comitiis subsignata die ad Vaticanum habitis, referente Emo et Rmo Dno Cardinali Camillo Mazzella, huiusce Causae Ponente seu Relatore, audito etiam R. P. D. Gustavo Persiani, Sanctae Fidei Promotoris munus gerente, omnibusque maturo examine perpensis, petitioni a tam ingenti numero Sacrorum Praesulum aliorumque praepositae rescribendum censuit : *Pro gratia, si Sanctissimo placuerit.* Die 23 Maii 1896.

Hisce omnibus subinde per me infrascriptum Cardinalem, Sacro eidem Coetui Praefectum, Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII. relatis, Sanctitas Sua sententiam Sacrae Congregationis confirmare et adprobare dignata est: ac Sanctum Petrum Claver, Confessorem e Societate Iesu, peculiarem apud Deum patronum sacrarum Missionum ad Nigritas Suprema Auctoritate Sua declaravit et constituit. Die 7 Iulii anno eodem.

CAI. CARD. ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*

ALOISIUS TRIPEPI, *S. R. C. Secret.*

II.

PRIVILEGIUM ANTICIPANDI MATUTINUM CUM LAUDIBUS HORA MERIDIANA.

(*Pro Ord. Min. Cappucin. Speciale.*)

Bme Pater,—Minister Westphalicae Provinciae Ordinis Minorum S. Francisci Cappuccinorum, ad pedes S. V. provolutus, humiliter exponit quod suae Provinciae Patres Sacris Expeditionibus vel Spiritualibus Exercitiis persaepe dant operam in bonum Christifidelium. Quum vero durante eiusmodi ministerio, nimis gravis Missionariis fiat recitatio Divini Officii horis statutis, Orator Indultum implorat quo Missionarii Cappuccini dictae Provinciae enuntiati ministerii Matutinum cum Laudibus anticipare possint immediate post horam duodecimam.—Et Deus, etc.

Sacra Rituum Congregatio vigore facultatum sibi specialiter a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII. tributarum, attentis expositis et commendationis officio Rmi P. Procuratoris Generalis suprascripti Ordinis, benigne indulsit, ut Missionarii enunciatae Provinciae Regularis, perdurantibus sacris expeditionibus, vel quando praedictioni ob spiritualia exercitia dant operam, immediate post meridiem Matutini cum Laudibus recitationem pridie anticipare valeant. Valituro praesenti Indulto ad proximum decennium. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 20 Novembris 1896.

CAJ. CARD. ALOISI-MASELLA, *Praef.*

L. ✠ S. D. PANICI, *Secret.*

III.

SEPULCRUM, FERIA V. HEBD. MAIORIS ERECTUM, NEQUE STATUIS PICTURISVE DECORANDUM.

Instantibus plerisque Rmis Episcopis variarum regionum, qui sacros ritus et caeremonias iuxta ecclesiasticas praescriptiones ac laudabiles consuetudines in suis dioecesibus observari satagunt, quaestio super Altari quod communiter dicitur *sepulcrum*, alias agitata, Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sub duplici sequenti dubio reproposita fuit; nimirum :

I. Utrum in Altari, in quo, Feria V. et VI. Maioris Hebdomadae, publicae adorationi exponitur et asservatur Sanctissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum, repraesentetur sepultura Domini, aut institutio eiusdem Augustissimi Sacramenti?

II. Utrum liceat ad exornandum praedictum Altare adhibere statuas aut picturas, nempe Beatissimae Virginis, S. Ioannis Evangelistae, S. Mariae Magdalenae et militum custodum, aliaque huiusmodi?

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio in ordinariis Comitiis subsignata die ad Vaticanum habitis, ad relationem infrascripti Cardinalis Sacrae eidem Congregationi Praefecti, exquisitis trium Rmorum Consultorum suffragiis scripto exaratis, attenta quoque antiqua et praesenti Ecclesiae disciplina, omnibusque maturo examine perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad. I. *Utramque.*

Ad. II. *Negative.* Poterunt tamen Episcopi, ubi antiqua consuetudo vigeat, huiusmodi repraesentationes tolerare; caveant autem ne novae consuetudines hac in re introducantur.

Atque ita rescripsit, contrariis quibuscumque decretis abrogatis. Die 15 Decembris 1896.

Facta postmodum de his Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII. per ipsum infrascriptum Cardinalem relatione, Sanctitas Sua Rescriptum Sacrae Congregationis ratum habuit, et confirmavit, iisdem die, mense et anno.

† CAI. CARD. ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*

L. ✠ S. D. PANICI, *Secretarius.*

IV.

FESTUM TITULARE IN ECCLESIIS SANCTAE INFANTIAE IESU DICATIS.

In dioecesi Bellevillensi extat Ecclesia parochialis dicata *Sanctae Infantiae Iesu*, et sacerdos eidem Ecclesiae adscriptus, de consensu sui Rmi Episcopi a Sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum resolutionem humillime postulavit:

I. Quando Festum Titularis Ecclesiae suae sit celebrandum?

II. Quod Officium cum Missa sit dicendum in hoc Festo?

III. An et quomodo facienda sit commemoratio in fine Laudum et Vesperarum inter commemorationes communes?

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque mature perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. Die 25 Decembris.

Ad II. Officium et Missa de Nativitate Domini.

Ad III. Quoad primam partem *Affirmative.*

Quoad secundam, ad Laudes dicatur: *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, etc., nempe antiphona *ad Benedictus*, in Laudibus Officii de Nativitate Domini. In Vesperis dicatur antiphona *ad Magnificat* in 2^is^ Vesperis eiusdem Nativatis, omissis *Hodie.*

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 18 Decembris 1896.

CAI. CARD. ALOISI-MASELLA S. R. C. *Praef.*

L.✠S. D. PANICI, *Secretarius.*

CONFERENCES.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

THE FACULTY OF OUR BISHOPS TO APPLY THE "SANATIO IN RADICE."

TO THE EDITOR, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

REV. DEAR SIR:—Allow me to say a few words in reply to the critic in the last number of the REVIEW who attacks my statements in regard to the power of our Bishops to apply the *sanatio in radice* in the case of *disparitas cultus*.

"Ignoratio elenchi," "begging the question," and the use of "a strange argument" are indeed grave offences against the laws of logic, and I cannot bring myself to believe that your learned correspondent, who honors me with the title of "my friend," and bestows upon my past labors such generous praise, uses these terms in their strict acceptation when making this charge. But be this as it may, in the interest of truth and sound theology, I must emphatically repeat that my contention stands approved, and that nothing has been advanced by my friendly opponent in his lengthy communication to cause me to change the views expressed in your March number, or to weaken in any way the force of my argument.

Indeed there appears much to strengthen my position, as becomes evident when we subject to a careful examination the statements set forth in my critic's second paragraph, beginning with the words "In the next place." In this paragraph it is stated that the question in controversy is: "Does that faculty (No. 6. Extraordinariae D.) empower our Bishops to heal marriages invalid on account of the impediment of

disparitas cultus?" Now, I maintain that this is not the question at issue at all. The real question is as to whether this special faculty of which we are speaking is positively excluded from the general concession made to our Bishops. My opponent contends that there is such positive exclusion in this case, and it naturally devolves upon him to prove his assertion. Has he done so? I think not. Hence the old principle well known to Canonists asserts itself: "*Continetur in concessione quidquid non excipitur.*" "But," reiterates my learned opponent, "it has been positively excluded," and in proof thereof he adduces the following citation from the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, Decree No. 339, which, for the better understanding of the point in question, I cite in full: "Haud raro accidit, ut in quibusdam locis paucae quaedam familiae Catholicae degant inter maximum acatholicorum numerum, quorum plerique baptismate haud sunt abluti. Ob sacerdotum vero penuriam, loca hujusmodi raro a Missionariis perlustrantur. Hinc evenit ut Catholici non pauci clam Ecclesia matrimonia invalida propter impedimentum *disparitatis cultus* ineant. Cum vero accesserit sacerdos, eum confitendi causa adeunt, atque eo monente, petunt ut sua matrimonia, quae saepe valida esse bona fide putaverant, rehabilitentur. At acatholicus conjux consensum renovare plerumque omnino recusat: ob locorum vero distantiam et temporis angustias Episcopus adiri vix potest; periculum autem manifestum est in mora. Hisce perpensis, censuerunt Patres, orandum esse S. Sedem, ut ipsis fiat potestas communicandi Missionariis qui talia loca forte inviserint, facultatem sanandi *in radice* vel alias rehabilitandi hujusmodi matrimonia in supra memoratis casibus, prout ipsis in Domino visum fuerit; hac tamen adjecta conditione ut quamprimum Episcopum certiorem facere debeant quandocumque hac facultate usi fuerint."

Now, this petition was not granted by the Holy See, as is well known. Starting from this fact, my opponent constructs an argument deemed by him unanswerable. Let me reduce it to syllogistic form: If our Bishops have the power of healing *in radice*, a marriage null and void on account of the

impediment of *disparitas cultus*, we must admit that they can sub-delegate that power, not only to their Vicars-General, but also to two or three priests in remote places of their dioceses. But this power of sub-delegating has been refused by Rome. Therefore, our Bishops have not the power to heal *in radice*, etc.

The *major* proposition of this syllogism will be readily granted by all, since it is expressly stated in No. 8, of the "*Facultates Extraordinariae D*," that they have the power "subdelegandi praesentes facultates suis Vicariis Generalibus, ... atque duobus vel tribus presbyteris sibi bene visis in locis remotioribus propriae dioecesis, pro aliquo tamen numero casuum urgentiorum, in quibus recursus ad ipsum haberi non possit." But is the *minor* proposition equally true? By no means. As it stands, it must be simply denied, and no proof can be brought forward to substantiate it. It rests on the false supposition that the clause "duobus vel tribus presbyteris sibi bene visis in locis remotioribus propriae diocesis" has reference to the same persons designated by the words "missionariis qui talia loca forte inviserint." Now this is far from being the case. The first class is clearly determined and closely restricted, while those named in the second part are pointed out in general terms, and might be understood to mean two or three or even twenty priests. On what ground, then, does my learned opponent use them indiscriminately? By what right does he conclude that Rome has refused our Bishops the power to sub-delegate a certain faculty "suis Vicariis Generalibus atque duobus vel tribus presbyteris sibi bene visis," simply because she has declined to grant the power to communicate that faculty "missionariis qui talia loca forte inviserint," and who might, perchance, be as many as twenty "bene visi;" or otherwise?

But I have not yet done with this useful quotation from our Second Plenary Council. The argument may be retorted, and I may say with truth, that this very petition of the Fathers of the Council, together with the answer given by Rome, proves most conclusively that our Bishops are

empowered to heal *in radice* marriages that are null and void by reason of *disparitas cultus*. In fact, why should the Fathers petition for the *extension* of a power which they did not already possess? And what did Rome refuse? Certainly not the power to heal *in radice*, nor even the authorization to sub-delegate that faculty in accordance with the conditions already laid down. She simply denied the permission to communicate that power to others than the two or three priests above mentioned. This is perfectly clear from the *Instructio III. S. C. de Prop. Fide, No. VI.*, where the appeal is thus expressed: "Voluerunt EE. PP. standum omnino esse formulis facultatum, ubi determinantur personae quibus memoratae facultates communicari possunt." Rightly, therefore, do I conclude from this document alone, prescinding from all else, that our Bishops have power to heal *in radice* marriages that are invalid on account of the impediment of *disparitas cultus*.

It would lead me far beyond the proper limits of the discussion to take up and answer in detail the several strictures passed on my previous communication. Two or three points, however, call for a word of explanation and defence.

That the charge of begging the question is gratuitous I trust to have shown, by pointing out the real issue that is in controversy. Moreover when in the March number of the REVIEW I asked: "Why should we discuss whether a certain thing could be done or not, when we have before us the very fact that it has been done," it seems to me that I sufficiently pointed out, not only the power of the Holy See, but also its willingness to grant such faculties. Greater stress perhaps than was needful was placed on the Holy See's power in this matter, but it was certainly not intended to exclude the further consideration of its willingness.

With regard to a clandestine marriage in New Orleans as compared with a marriage contracted by a Catholic and one unbaptized before a Protestant minister in Philadelphia, with all due respect to my worthy opponent, I am still of opinion that the majority of my readers would agree with me in the answer. When therefore he says: "Whilst all Catholics, as

a rule, know the law forbidding them to marry before a minister, few comparatively know the law against clandestine marriages," his proposition admits of a clear and evident distinction. Few know of this law in those countries, or sections of a country, where the *Tametsi* does not ex st, I willingly concede; but in regions where it is duly promulgated and fully respected, as we must suppose it to be in New Orleans, there is, I would venture to say, no matrimonial impediment more universally known and understood. The supposed case of the two Baltimoreans is in so many features exceptional that I do not see how with justice it can be brought to bear against my more general comparison. Finally, it is asked, "Can it then be true, as Fr. Sabetti avers, that the absence in clandestine marriages of the "species extrinseca veri matrimonii" was the reason why Rome refused to grant our Bishops faculties to heal *in radice* marriages null on account of the impediment of clandestinity?" It was not my intention, I answer, to assign this as the only or final reason. I advanced it simply as a probable explanation of why Rome had so acted, and as such I think it may be allowed to stand. But, after all, our discussion does not turn on the motives or reasons for any act of Pontifical legislation, nor, at least as far as I am concerned, does it rest on any *a pari* or even *a fortiori* line of argumentation. There is question, I repeat, of positive enactment, and we find clearly set down among the faculties granted our Bishops that of "sanandi in radice matrimonia contracta, quando comperitur adfuisse impedimentum dirimens super quo ex Apostolicae Sedis indulto dispensare ipse possit." Now, I contend that the *impedimentum disparitatis cultus* is one in which our Bishops can thus dispense, unless my critic can show from some other document that this case has been excepted by the Holy See. I fail to see that he has done so. The petition and its answer from Rome mentioned in No. 339 of the Decrees of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore refers, as I have shown, to an extension of powers already possessed, not to their first concession.

One difficulty remains to be answered. My opponent

asks: "Does not the grant of powers in No. 6, Extraordinariae D suppose a *pars innoxia* and a *pars conscia impedimenti?* To whom are these terms applicable in a case in which a Catholic has attempted to marry a non-baptized person? The latter knows, as a rule, just as well as the former, in what light the Catholic Church holds such marriages." This objection is ably met, or rather forestalled, by the late Fr. Konings, C.SS.R., in his "Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas," Art. 6, p. 118, No. 172, Edition of 1884: "Si altera etiam pars conscia quidem esset impedimenti, sed ad ejus vim irritantem non satis attenderet, aut hanc vim ignoraret, aut non crederet, aut non satis perspectam haberet, Episcopi nostri, hujus partis consensu non revocato, dispensare etiamnum possent." Does this not cover the case of most non-baptized persons, who have at best only what might be called a half-consciousness of the force of our matrimonial impediments, and, consequently, as Fr. Konings maintains, may be regarded as *non conscii* in the eyes of the Church? I might further remark that *innoxia* is in no sense antithetical to *conscia.* One and the same person may be, and frequently is, both the *pars innoxia* and the *pars conscia.* This we gather from No. 175, on the page already cited of Fr. Konings' invaluable little treatise. "*A parte innoxia*, criminis nempe, quod causam dedit impedimento. Cogita copulam, quam altera pars ante matrimonium habuit cum compartis consanguineo vel consanguinea in primo vel secundo gradu."

In conclusion, I trust that my remarks will help your learned correspondent to see this matter in the same light as myself, the more so as his criticism is couched in such friendly language, and since he has candidly and disinterestedly made confession that for the sake of the general good he would gladly have me right and himself wrong.

A. SABETTI, S. J.

THE S. CONGREGATION OF PROPAGANDA IN REGARD TO THE "SANATIO IN RADICE."

The following letter sent in 1889 (May 8, N. 1277 di Protocollo), by Cardinal Simeoni, to the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Belleville, to whose courtesy we are indebted for its publication now, removes the doubt as to whether our Bishops have the power to apply the *sanatio in radice* in the case of the *disparitas cultus;* and it also endorses our original position as to the duty of the Catholic party under the circumstances.

Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Domine,

In litteris sub die 14. Februarii currentis anni Amplitudo Tua exponebat in istis regionibus frequenter contingere solere ut juvenis vel puella catholica matrimonium coram civili magistratu contrahat cum infideli quin dispensatio obtenta fuerit ab impedimento dirimente *disparitatis cultus.* At contingit ut pars catholica poenitentia ducta, cum pro certo habeat partem infidelem conditiones ab Ecclesia requisitas pro dispensatione ab existente impedimento obtinenda non excepturam esse, petit *sanatio in radice.* Quo posito A. T. quaerit: "An Epūs utens facultatibus extraordinariis in formula D contentis sanare valeat in radice matrimonium in casu, an insistere ut a parte infideli pars catholica separetur?"

Maturo super hac re examine instituto respondendum videtur:

"Ad primam partem dubii "*Affirmative;*" hoc enim in casu ad partis catholicae spirituali saluti consulendum *sanatio in radice* indulgeri solet. Pars vero catholica promittere debet se pro viribus curaturam observantiam legum ecclesiasticarum, conjugis infidelis conversionem ac catholicam prolis educationem.

Ad secundam partem: "*Pendere ex circumstantiis particularibus.*"

Interim Deum precor ut Te diu sospitet

A. T.

Addictissimus uti Frater

IOANNES *Card.* SIMEONI, *Praefectus.*

✠ ARCHIEP. TYREN., *Secr.*

DNO. IOANNI IANSSEN,
Epō Bellevillensi.

THE PRAYERS AFTER LOW MASS.

Qu. There is, as is well known, a lack of uniformity in the manner of reciting the prayers after Mass prescribed by the present Pope. Some priests after the last Gospel take the chalice, descend to the foot of the altar, and there say the prayers; others kneel on the predella leaving the chalice on the altar while they recite the prayers. Some use the Latin form, others the vernacular. Occasionally the celebrant, having to say two Masses in succession, recites the prayers after the second Mass only; priests giving Holy Communion after Mass, frequently defer the prayers until after the distribution.

Is there no uniform rule based on the wording of the *original document*, which prescribes the recitation of these prayers, or are there no decisions of the S. Congregation which clear up the doubts suggested by the above differences of rite?

Resp. The questions as to (a), *when;* (b), *in what manner*, and (c), *in what language* the prescribed prayers after Low Mass are to be recited, were answered in an early number of the REVIEW. We briefly re-state the matter.

(*a*), The prayers are to be recited immediately after the last Gospel, that is, without allowing any other function, such as distribution of H. Communion, etc., to intervene. This is plain from an answer of the S. R. Congregation (November 23, 1887): "Preces a SSo. D. N. Leone Papa XIII. post missam praescriptae recitandae sunt *immediate* expleto ultimo Evangelio."

When several Masses are said in succession, as on Christmas day (or on All Souls' day, by special privilege), the prayers are to be recited but once, at the end of the last Mass. (S.R.C. 10 Mai., 1895. Cf. AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, November, 1895, p. 386.) This, however, implies that the same congregation assist at these Masses. Otherwise it seems more conformable to the original purpose of the prescription that the prayers be said after each Mass, and a short interval be allowed the congregation to change place before beginning the second Mass.

(*b*), As to the manner of reciting these prayers, a writer in

the *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (Vol. III., p. 478) aptly observes: "Sacerdos, dicto ultimo evangelio, decentius *manibus junctis* ad medium altaris redit, tum facta cruci minima inclinatione, per latus suum dextrum se volvit, retrahens se tantillum ad cornu evangelii, descendit a suppedaneo, super quo genuflexsus recitat cum populo tres *Ave Maria*, Ant. *Salve Regina*, et orationes sequentes. Tum surgit, ad altare rursum accedit, accipit calicem, et more solito descendit."

The celebrant may say these prayers kneeling either on the predella, or on the lowest steps of the altar, but *not* with the chalice in his hand, as this is contrary to the express rubric accompanying the form prescribed for these prayers, which states that they are to be recited "*junctis manibus.*"

(*c*) The prayers may be said in Latin or in the vernacular, but so that the congregation can answer the priest. This is plain from the expression of the S. Congregation, which says that they are to be recited *alternatim cum populo.* (S.R.C. 20 Aug., 1884.) As the people, outside of the Latin countries, would be generally unable to join in these prayers unless they were recited in their own language, it follows that the vernacular is the ordinary form to be used.

RECITATION OF THE ROSARY IN CATHEDRAL CHURCHES.

Qu. I understand there is a decree issued by Leo XIII. requiring that the Rosary of the B. V. M. be publicly recited in each Cathedral church every day in the year, and also in each parish church on Sundays and holidays of obligation.

I am not aware of any such decree and would be pleased if you would inform your readers regarding it.

Resp. The Decree with its interpretation was published in the REVIEW (vol. i, Jan., 1889, pg. 354).

In a Brief (24 Dec. 1883), "Salutaris ille," on the subject of devotion to our Bl. Lady the Sovereign Pontiff says: "We exhort and beseech all to persist religiously and constantly in the custom of daily reciting the Rosary; and we declare it to

be our wish that *in the principal church* (cathedral) *of each diocese it should be recited every day, and in all parish churches every Sunday and festival day.*" The expression "nobis esse in optatis," which the Holy Father here uses, does not imply a strict obligation (in the sense of a law); it urges strenuously the practice as defined, wherever it is possible, as a means of reform through union of prayer.

A BISHOP OFFICIATING WITHOUT PONTIFICALS.

Qu. Is it lawful for a Bishop to officiate in his Cathedral church or in any church at a *missa cantata*, or at a *missa solemnis*, or at simple or solemn Vespers or Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, where he cannot provide a sufficient number of priests for pontifical ceremonies?

Is there any decree prohibiting Bishops from officiating on such occasions when it might prove to be of great benefit to the people, or is it simply a matter which the hierarchy deems *infra dignitatem?*

Resp. The sense of the S. Congregation on this subject may be gathered from an answer given to the Bishop of Vincennes (15 June, 1881), in which the latter asked regarding the custom of assisting in mozzetta and rochet at a Solemn Mass. The S. C. held that, as the liturgical law demanded that a Bishop should not assist in cappa magna, much less in pluviale and mitre at a *missa cantata* without sacred ministers, it would be much less becoming to assist on his throne with rochet and mozzetta. It referred to a previous instruction given to the Bishop of Grass Valley, and to the following answer of the S. C.: "*Episcopus non in sede ordinaria sed in primo stallo in choro super omnes alios assistat.*" (Cf. Collectan. S. C. de Prop. n. 137.)

THE OBLIGATION TO HEAR MASS.

Qu. Are the faithful who are unable to hear Mass on Sundays and holidays the whole year through bound "jure divino" to attend Mass "sometimes" (v. g., three or four times on week days) during the year?

If so, what is the ratio of the obligation, and how must a confessor act in the matter?

Vide Lehmkuhl, Vol. I., No. 567, pages 340–341.

WORKHOUSE CHAPLAIN.

Resp. Turning to the passage in Lehmkuhl referred to by our correspondent, we find the following: "Verum hic attendas velim, praeceptum divinum adesse, aliquoties saltem, si fieri possit, Sacro interesse. Si enim ex divino praecepto, ut communius fatentur, sacerdos aliquoties in anno celebrare tenetur, fideles etiam potiore jure sacrificii N. L. participari debent."

With all due respect for the great moralist, we cannot agree with him in holding that the obligation of hearing Mass, sometimes each year, is *de jure divino*, and the reason he advances to support his position seems to us destitute of proving force. Apart from the fact that no other theologian, as far as we know, speaks of this divine law to assist at Mass, can we in justice apply to the faithful in general what is said of priests? Do they in hearing Mass represent officially and solemnly the Church of Christ as priests do at the altar? Hence Lehmkuhl's *a pari* (or rather *a fortiori*) argument falls to the ground.

Furthermore, we may safely deny the existence of a divine law binding every priest to offer the Holy Sacrifice "aliquoties in anno," or, as other theologians put it, "ter vel quater in anno." It is "sententia communior" according to St. Alphonsus, and according to many others, "opinio probabilior," that every priest is bound to do so, but we should have more than this before we urge the strict obligation of the law. In fact, the opposite opinion is called by Suarez "probable," and Cardinal de Lugo (disp. 20, No. 2) not only favors this opinion, but distinctly states that the reasons

advanced by the theologians of the other side prove nothing. For instance, the words of our Lord, "Hoc facite in meam commemorationem," most certainly contain a precept, but this precept is not given to each priest in particular, "sed ipsorum communitati, nempe ut curent ne in Ecclesia Dei desit oblatio hujus sacrificii." See St. Alphons. *De Eucharistia*, No. 313, and Ballerini-Palmieri, Vol. IV., No. 243, page 716.

For the rest, barring the inconsequential "*Hinc*," we incline to accept Fr. Lehmkuhl's conclusion: "Hinc qui ordinarie impediuntur, quominus intersint Sacro diebus festivis, aliquoties tamen incommodum longioris distantiae gravioremque difficultatem vincere debent ut possint Missae assistere." The reason why we are in favor of this "vincere debent" is because the attendance at Mass is among the ordinary means for leading a good Christian life, and we may well doubt the practical Catholicity of one who will not, at least occasionally, make some extra effort to be present at the Holy Sacrifice. In the absence, then, of any divine precept, it must rest with the prudence of the confessor to decide in each particular case what is advisable and practicable. Here, as elsewhere in moral matters, no fixed rule can be laid down.

A. S.

THE THEOPHANIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Qu. When we read in the O. T. that God appeared to man in the guise of an angel or in human form, are we to understand that God assumed human form as Christ did in the Incarnation, or rather that He employed one of His creatures (angel or man) to execute His behests?

Resp. The question whether the manifestation of the divine power, mentioned in the Old Testament, should be attributed to an angel in the common acceptation of the term, or to God Himself—the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Son, the Word of God—is of considerable importance in the study of theology.

From its solution depends a correct interpretation of many Scriptural texts; also the force of the arguments, used by the Fathers in the early Church, in support of the plurality of Persons in the Blessed Trinity, deduced from the fact that the God, who appeared to Moses and others, should be distinguished from another Person who is also called God. It is also useful to know whether the name and attributes—given and mentioned on those occasions—were *accommodated* to a simple creature, or whether he to whom the name of God is attributed be really the Son of God. For, in this case, the Divinity of Christ would be more clearly established by proofs drawn from the Old Testament.

The question may be briefly stated thus: Was the God mentioned in the Old Testament (who appeared under that name as a created being) a real angel or was he the Son of God Himself, who assumed a corporeal appearance to which He was not hypostatically united, of which He was, however, the intrinsic motor, thus making Himself visible to human eyes?

The opinion of Rosenmüller—who has some Protestant followers—cannot be entertained without doing violence to the text. The theory that these apparitions are due to natural causes by which God manifested His presence is altogether too far-fetched.

The Scholastics, with St. Thomas for their leader, whom they follow somewhat too closely, being himself, it appears, misled by a doubtful statement, made by St. Augustine, contradicted in his book *De Videndo Deo*, holds that these manifestations are purely angelical.

Danko enumerates St. Augustine with SS. Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, Cyril of Alexandria, and St. John Chrysostom, as holding the opinion that the Old Testament apparitions are to be attributed to the *Logos*. (Danko, *His. Rev. Div. P.* 220.)

The Louvain professor, Vanderbroeck, in his inaugural dissertation, defends this opinion, as did his eminent colleague, Beelen, in his commentary on the Acts of the Apos-

tles. (7 T.) To these eminent scholars may be added Reinke and Gagaron. The latter says: "At the present day the interpreters of Holy Writ and theologians defend the opinion of the Fathers of the first centuries, which holds that the Angelophanies were in reality Theophanies, and thus present to our view the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity as appearing to the Patriarchs." *Études Religieuses*, p. 843.

It cannot be denied that there are Scriptural arguments of weight in favor of both opinions.

The advocates of the first opinion quote Baruch, iii. 38: "*Afterwards He was seen upon earth and conversed with men.*" This text, according to the usage of the prophets, who often use the past for the present tense in order to indicate the certainty of the event, refers to the period after the Incarnation, and hence it follows that the Second Person had not appeared before that time.

This text is not conclusive against the upholders of the latter opinion, because Baruch refers to the hypostatical conversation. Neither does Heb. xi.: "*God having spoken on divers occasions and many ways in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days has spoken to us by the Son,*" avail much. Here St. Paul evidently opposes early revelations to the later ones made by Christ. In the same Epistle, iii., 2, the Apostle to the Gentiles commends hospitality and gives an example that "*Some, not being aware of it, have entertained angels.*" Had it been the Son of God who was entertained on that occasion (Gen. xviii.), more stress would have been given to the argument. It seems, however, that St. Paul in this case would rather say, for the enforcement of his argument, they received an angel who represented God in person. Moreover, it may be that St. Paul, the Apostle, had in mind instances when real angels were the guests of men, as in the case of Tobias. Again (Heb. xxii.), "*For if the word spoken by angels became steadfast,*" etc. From this it would appear that the revelation of the Old Testament is inferior to that of the New because the former was given by angels, the latter by the Son. This reasoning is weak. The comparison lies not between the promulgators,

but the things promulgated. The word "angel" is used as an adjective, and the text should read: "*In the presence of angels.*" Gal. iii. 19, is no more to the purpose: "*The promise being ordained by angels.*" The angels made no law on Mt. Sinai. They were present at its promulgation. (Gen. iii. 3.) The same can be said of Acts, vii. 53: "*Who have received the law by the disposition of angels and have not kept it.*" It is true that, Acts vii. 8, we have "*The angel who spoke to Him on Mt. Sinai and with our fathers,*" but we also have Mal. iii. 1., Zac. i. 11 and iii. 1, who speak of the Son as an angel, but in a higher and more excellent sense as an interpreter of God's will to man.

It is urged that when the Son is named in sacred Scripture under the cognomen angel, a qualifying epithet is added, as in Mal. iii. 1 and Zach. i. 11, 12, "*Angel of the Testament,*" "*Angel of Jehovah,*" whereas in many places the word "*Angel*" is used, and consequently a creature is meant. This argument, however, can be disposed of by showing that in many places the angel is named "LORD-GOD," as in the Acts xxxi. 32. It is useless to say that the word angel means "*minister,*" and hence cannot be applied to the Son previous to the Incarnation. Quod gratis asseritur, gratis negatur. The word in no sense implies the idea of minister; it always means messenger.

We fail to see any force in the argument drawn from the incongruity of the Son engaging in a wrestle with Jacob, Gen. xxiii. 24, or His assumption of the leadership of the people of Israel through the desert. In both these instances there is a deep significance, being typifications of the great power conferred on the Jewish race.

Finally, Ex. xxiii. 20, "*Behold, I will send my angel, who will go before thee,*" it is claimed as proof positive that the angel mentioned here is not the Son, because he is spoken of as *sent.* We confess that this is a real difficulty. We may however, respond that the Son here speaks of Himself in the third person; thus, "I shall come in an assumed body," or, "I shall appear in human form (as I have now appeared) and go before you." This interpretation constrains us to

interpret the words of ver. 21, "*and my name is in him*," as "THE SAME WHO I AM."

We now come to the arguments in favor of Theophanies, not Angelophanies, in the Old Testament. Many and most explicit are the texts in favor of this opinion. Ex. iii. 6, "*He Who appeared declares Himself God. I am the God of thy Father, the God of Abraham.*" Of the same person the sacred writer repeatedly predicates the appellation proper to God alone and incommunicable, namely, JEHOVAH. Ex. iii. 16, "*The God of your fathers hath appeared to me*," and 19, JEHOVAH is said to have descended on Sinai. Ex. xx. 1, To have spoken to the Israelites. Deut. iv. 12, 15, His voice was heard. To JEHOVAH is ascribed what was done by the angel who appeared to Hagar. Gen. xvi., She herself affirms that she had seen the *Lord*. Deut. xxiii. 16, Moses implores the blessing of Him who appeared in the burning bush, consequently of God, not of an angel. God appears, Deut. v. 4, "*face to face*," and speaks "*mouth to mouth.*" Num. xii. 8, Ex. xxxiii. 11, consequently immediately and without angelic intervention. St. Thomas admits this. Sum. The. 2a, 2ae, a4, and quotes St. Augustine in maintaining that Moses saw the divine essence on the occasion mentioned in Num. xii. 68. Hence we see that the Scholastics, in adopting and blindly following St. Thomas, have only a waverer for a leader.

Ex. xxxiii. 2, 17, God threatens the people of Israel with an angelic leadership, declaring His intention of ceasing to lead them in person. This threat Moses averts by his prayers and obtains a promise that God will continue to lead His people. V. 5, 14. In Isaiah lxiii. 9, the Septuagint says "*Neither legate nor angel, but God, Himself, saved them*"—the people of Israel—when God led them through the desert. The Hebrew text, it is true, is not favorable to this rendering, and the Douay version has: And the angel of his presence saved them. Heb. xii. 25. St. Paul, speaking of Jesus Christ, says that He who spoke upon earth when the law was promulgated is the same who now speaks from Heaven. In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, x. 9,

the Jews are said to have tempted *Christ.* In the Acts vii. 2, He who appeared to Abraham, is called the God of glory. The apostle, Jude, 5, declares that Jesus Christ Himself, "having *saved the people out of the land of Egypt, did afterwards destroy those who believed not.*"

Lastly, the Church, in the office of Advent, appeals to that "ADONAI" *who appeared in the fire of the flaming bush to Moses and also gave him the Law.* Her meaning is made clear when, in the prayer of the feast of St. Catherine, she prays to Him, (God), "who gave the law to Moses in Sinai, and there, by the ministry of angels, placed the body of St. Catharine," etc. Here is a contradistinction between the Promulgator of the Law on Mt. Sinai and the angels or created spirits. The well-known axiom, *Lex credendi lex supplicandi*, shows that the Church is more favorable to our opinion than to that of our adversaries.

JOHN A. FANNING, D.D.

BOOK REVIEW.

ONTOLOGIA, METAPHYSICA GENERALIS. Auctore P. Carolo Delmas, S.J. Parisiis. Victor Retaux, Via Bonaparte 82, 1896. pp. xxxvi., 882. Pr. 8 francs.

Let not the reader turn away with the exclamation—"Another Metaphysics!" It is true, his attention has been called not infrequently in the pages of this REVIEW to works falling within the same species as the one here at hand, but there has generally been a sufficient showing of individual variation from the type to justify the claim to notice. This will be found to be especially the case in the metaphysics by Père Delmas. The work could hardly sum up the labors of twenty years' professorship—as it does—within the French and Spanish scholasticates of the Society of Jesus, without presenting some individual excellencies that warrant its being given a place in the already large bibliography of its subject.

It would of course be idle to look for such excellencies in the line of novelty, either of doctrine or of general method. For two thousand years and more the keenest and broadest minds of humanity have been studying the primary attributes and groupings of Being; so that the geology and the geography of the metaphysical world may be regarded as quite thoroughly explored. What Aristotle, St. Thomas and Suarez, with their army of medieval and neo-scholastic followers have not discovered in the domain of pure metaphysics, is hardly likely to present itself to the independent explorer of to-day. The history moreover of philosophy is but too sad a tale of the hopeless wanderings and misfortunes of those whose pride and ambition have led them to despise the charts and compasses and descriptions of veteran guides, and to stray off in search of untrodden paths. The aim of Père Delmas has been to present the metaphysics of the greater masters with order, precision and thoroughness. This however, it will be said, is the aim of every author of his class. Wherein, then, lies his special merit, his peculiar claim for recognition? It lies, to our thinking, in his practical realization of the difficulties of environment with which metaphysics has specially to contend in these days, viz., the non-admission of the scientific character of metaphysics and the denial of the

objectivity of metaphysical concepts. The treatment accorded by Mr. Lewes in his history of philosophy to the "fossil folios" of the scholastics—"monstrous and lifeless shapes of a former world, having little community with the life of our own and an interest similar to that yielded by the megatherium and the dinornis"—sums up fairly well the mental attitude with which the followers of the popular philosophy—and even others who should know better—regard metaphysical subjects, a mental attitude aptly illustrated by the "eminent English statesman who, at a public distribution of prizes, is reported to have cautioned his youthful auditors against metaphysics of any kind whatever, adding that it was absolutely a waste of time; far better read one of Dickens' novels, because metaphysics began by assuming something that was not true, and ended in something that was absurd." [Harper's Metaphysics of the School. Vol. I, p. xi.]

The consciousness of this mental attitude pervades the work of Père Delmas. Accordingly, at the very start, having defined the subject and limits of metaphysical inquiry, he singles out its adversaries,—materialism, Kantism, agnosticism—and against these he establishes the objectivity of metaphysics and its just claim to the appellation—*scientific*. Thirty pages are allotted to the establishing of the definition of the subject. To this point of view, moreover, he adheres throughout. To each of the more important concepts of his science he assigns two theses, one to analyse and explain the subject, the other to prove its objective validity. After this fashion he has discussed the notion of being, essence, potentiality, and "act," unity, truth, goodness, substance, nature, person, accident, modality, quality, relation, cause, action, finality, the infinite and beauty. Thirty large questions group themselves around these central concepts. Each question is handled in a manner that greatly miminizes the difficulties of the subject. First, the general meaning of the problem, the various theories, the difficulties, and the order of discussion are laid down. To this bird's-eye view succeed the various theses with their demonstrations, each thesis including an explanation of its precise meaning and bearing, and having appended special references to collateral readings.

Let it be noted in conclusion that the book is no ordinary, jejune manual. It appeals to the serious student, and best to those of matured minds. Most useful will it be found by post-graduates of a philosophical course and as an adjunct to theological study.

F. P. S.

BOOKS AND THEIR MAKERS DURING THE MIDDLE AGES. A Study of the conditions of the Production and Distribution of Literature from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the close of the Seventeenth Century. Vol. I., 476-1600. Vol. II., 1500-1709. By George Haven Putnam, A. M.—G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York and London. 1896 and 1897. Pp. xxvii., 459 and 538. Pr. $5.00.

There have not been many books of late years which so distinctly contribute to raise the standard of American authorship as the volumes of G. H. Putnam. This is particularly true of the work before us, which represents the fruit of long and discriminating labor in the field of bibliography. The territory which opens to the student in this department is indeed boundless although it has its landmarks in the works of such men as De la Caille and Andrew Chevillier, of two centuries ago, and, in different ways, of Maittaire, De Guignes, Audifred, a century later. Within our own time the interest in this domain of literature has greatly increased. Not forgetting the earlier Dibdin, we have in England the names of University men such as Humphrey, Curwen, Blades, Madan, Brown (following Castellani), associated with different lines of study aiming at illustrating the subject of books and their makers. In France and Belgium there have likewise appeared a large number of works and monographs dealing with this topic, whilst professors of Leipzig, to speak of only one typical book-centre, bid fair to outdo each other in studies regarding the production of books since Gutenberg. There are numerous volumes, too, which deal with the local and personal history of individual printer-publishers such as the Caxtons, the Stephens, or the Plantins, a firm which maintained its standing as a leading publishing house for three centuries until recently it was turned into a national keepsake.

With this varied and scattered material our author shows himself familiar, and it furnishes him not only with data, but also with the historical motives of the times through which his theme of Books and Bookmakers threads its way. He writes as a man above prejudice, though not free from bias. Every student of general history understands the preference which attributes to the principles of the so-called Reformation certain effects which represent in reality nothing more or less than a reaction upon the neglect of Catholic authorities to carry out the principles of the old

Church. That is the best motive which can be ascribed to the religious revolt of the sixteenth century. It opposed the inertness of a strong body by a measure which probably moved that body to action, but which apart from that body wrought disintegration. The influence of Luther's personality is due not to the excellence of the creed he fashioned, nor to any unselfish aim of his own—though he may have had noble impulses, but to the fact that the hope of self-preservation forced him to lay hold of an instrument which proved to be a lever that diverted the slide of popular dissatisfaction into an open field where it could expand. He promulgated a principle which suited everybody—the princes for one reason, the masses for another—but which men before him could not have forced with the same success because the one great means that did it was wanting—that was the printing press.

The whole system of Luther's teaching meant a fostering of the printing and bookmaking trade, and the trade saw in its own good the good of the new religion. There were few who had not reason to favor the novelty from a temporal point of view. Freedom, prosperity, culture, these three ideas were intimately bound up in the popular mind with new religion, and the printing press made these ideas which have their dark as well as their light side, familiar to all. To those who inwardly hated or despised the clergy, the principle of every man being his own minister of the truth was most flattering ; to those who cared nothing for the clergy because they did not depend on them, yet who disliked the restraints always implied in the precepts of the Church, the idea of reading the Bible and bamboozling themselves into a pious feeling of faith requiring no works to render it efficient, proved a soothing substitute for the old irksome tasks enforced often by men who sat "in the chair of Moses" without turning a finger for their own salvation. So the fact that the clergy were negligent, whilst it did not make Luther's doctrine true, made it appear justifiable. Then came the intellectual elevation, the conscious superiority of the followers of the new doctrine who, since the Bible was to be the sole rule of faith, felt the necessity of reading it, and thus were at once identified with the proud classes of the humanists who had hitherto monopolized the art of reading. As there was to be no appeal to any judge or court from the Bible, it followed that the Bible had to be in every man's hand. Was it any wonder that the opponents of Luther's doctrine felt and ill-disguised their aversion for what to them was a plain abuse of the Bible turned to the destruction of living faith?

On the other hand, the printers felt that this new movement brought trade to them. So they helped the spread of the novelty, and thus the preponderance of literary and publishing activity was transferred to the north of Germany, whereas it had flourished before then in the centres of Catholic activity, where art and science were at least equally honored as handmaids of truth. The explanation of the fact that the sympathies of the larger book-publishing centres were with the Protestants (Vol II., 221), is an easy inference, and we ask ourselves why Erasmus should have advised Froben not to publish Luther's works, unless it was because he realized that rapid sales of the new books were no adequate compensation for the loss of the old faith. Koburger, too, thought so.

As for the *Prohibitive Index*, any unbiased student of those times must realize that it was the most natural and reasonable outcome of the existing conditions; it certainly did not indicate that the Church was hostile to the free and right use of the classics or to the diffusion of literary works in general. Luther is supposed to have claimed the broadest liberty in favor of the use of the press, yet we find him in 1525 invoking the aid of the censorship-regulations of Saxony and Brandenburg against the "pernicious doctrines" of Anabaptists and Zwinglians.

All these facts are brought out by Mr. Putnam, though not quite as we would state them. He does not ignore, as many Protestant writers affect to do, that the Roman Church is the first of agencies to whom we owe the preservation of the great literary works of past ages; that the incentives to literary labor in the case of her sons—such as those of a Cassiodorus, a Benedict, a Gregory—"were no longer the laurel crown of the circus, the favors of a patron, or the *honoraria* of the publishers, but the glory of God and the service of the Church."

This is encouraging when we remember the usual way in which history is tortured into championship against the Catholic Church. On the other hand, there remains the tendency to mis-state against Catholics whatever is not proved to be for them. Let me give an instance in which Mr. Putnam follows this *procès de tendence*, so common among historians; and although we do not assume that he had at his command the facts of the case, as we know them from unquestionable documents, yet there was no warrant whatever for drawing a conclusion which can be proved singularly untrue. Speaking of the German printer-publishers in Italy, Schroeinheim and Pannartz, who organized a press in the monastery of Subiaco (1465), where

they printed a fine series of Latin classics (including the works of Cicero, Apuleius, Gellius, Caesar, Virgil, Livy, Strabo, Lucan, Pliny, Suetonius, Quintilian, Ovid, etc., also The Fathers of the Church, such as Augustine, Jerome, Cyprian, the Bible, and the Scripture-Commentaries of Nicolas de Lyra), our author charges Sixtus IV. with indifference to the request of these printers later on, when they asked him for support. The Pope, he says, "was somewhat avaricious, and preferred to use his money to provide for a large circle of relatives rather than support a publishing business. The printers were, therefore, unable to secure any aid from the Papal treasury, and in 1472 they brought their business to a close." (Vol. I., p. 406.)

Now this is, of course, what Lorck and Gregorovius, and Pattmann, and lesser lights assume because there was at one time wanting the clear evidence that the Pontiff had favorably answered Bishop Bussi's request in behalf of the aforementioned German printers. But that assumption was disproved some years ago when the *Registra* of the pontiffs in the Vatican Archives were laid open to the inspection of historical students. There (Vol. I. of the Supplic. ann. I. of Sixt. IV.) the whole transaction, the letter of Bussi and those of the two printers, who were, it seems, clerics in minors (Pannartz proving himself a native of Cologne, not of Prag as was generally believed), are given. They seem to have made extraordinary claims in view of the numerous valuable books they had already printed ; but the Pontiff granted all they asked, as indeed might have been expected, since he was one of the most generously disposed patrons of arts and letters (being of the Rovere family) and especially favorable to German scholars and artists. The document containing the answer to the petition of the printers, who wanted, it appears, a competency for life rather than the means of perpetuating a printing office, is reproduced in full by Dr. Joseph Schlecht in a paper published for the eleventh centenary of the German Campo Santo in Rome, under the title of "Sixtus IV. und die deutschen Drucker in Rome."

Other instances, regarding which we have nothing so clear or so recent as in the present case, are mentioned with the same inevitable assumption that because churchmen are at times unworthy, every unworthy result must be laid at the door of the Church, and where men cannot be proved innocent they are guilty, especially when they are priests or monks or popes.

But the discriminating reader will find abundance of interesting

and instructive material in this historic record of literary production—or rather of the factors which controlled that production previous to the copyright legislation of the early eighteenth century. The argument, the details of research, and the style are equally fascinating to the student of the intellectual development of Christian nations.

HIS DIVINE MAJESTY; or, The Living God. By William Humphrey, S.J.—London: Thomas Baker, Soho Square. 1897. Pp. 441. Pr. $2.50.

Father Humphrey's numerous works make an almost complete library of dogmatic, scriptural, moral and ascetical theology. Some of them appeal to Catholics exclusively, others are polemical or at least apologetic in the scientific meaning of the term. His last volume claims the respectful attention of every man who recognizes the forces of a spiritual being within or around him. "Every detail," to use the words of the author in his preface, "of any truth which directly concerns His divine Majesty, the only one true and living God, must necessarily be of supreme interest to every thinking man." Nevertheless, the author feels that "not a few of those who would otherwise be eager to study God, at least as minutely as they are wont to study other objects of knowledge, are repelled by what seems to them to be the abstruseness of the argument." To such persons the book is recommended as a source of reference to which they may turn for information on particular points. "They might be glad to know exactly, neither more nor less, what is meant by such words as essence, attributes, substance, being, nature, person, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, natural, supernatural, preternatural. . . . I have had the benefit of such readers in view, along with the convenience of the general reader, in providing a very copious Table of Contents."

This makes at once plain what particular value Father Humphrey's book has for the student of philosophy and Catholic theology, since the use of a peculiar terminology primarily intended to facilitate accuracy and power of dialectic thinking often prevents the practical application of the argument outside of the class-hall or the theological conference. A student, therefore, must not only learn this language, but he must be able to interpret it to those who are not familiar with the precise meaning of the forms which he makes

use of. To this end Fr. Humphrey's book is, as we said, a decided help.

Among the attributes of God which the work discusses is that of His "sincere will of man's salvation." It is a topic enveloped for many in the haziest notions of seemingly contradictory truths. Our author makes it very plain by the manner of his distinctions. So also he makes clear the rational motives of credibility for believing in the mysteries of the Holy Trinity and other supernatural truths, by the use of philosophy. "We use philosophy in theology in three ways: to demonstrate those natural truths of reason which are preambles of faith;—to make known by similitudes truths which are of faith, and to refute statements which are contrary to faith, either by showing them to be false, or by showing that they are not necessary conclusions."

FOUNDATIONS OF FAITH. Part I. The Existence of God Demonstrated. By Fr. L. von Hammerstein, S. J. (Translated from the German.)—London: Burns and Oates. (Benziger Bros.) 1897. Pp. 307.

The principal stress in the argument demonstrating the existence of God is here laid upon what is called the *cosmological* proof. The dependence of everything around and within ourselves points to the existence of a power which produces and holds all the dependencies in their relative order. This power, which the existence of all else that is contingent postulates, must of necessity have the endowments which we call the Divine attributes—self-existent, eternal and complete, according to the evidence of their multiform manifestation in the inorganic, organic, animal, intellectual or psychical spheres of creation.

Darwinism and Haeckelism, the Monism theory and the various hypothetical quantities and qualities invented by theists and atheists to account for the construction of the universe on any principle but that of absolute creation are well treated, and from the scientific rather than the theological point of view. Indeed, the result which waited on the first publication of the arguments contained in this book strikingly proves the cogency of Fr. Hammerstein's method. It appears that after the author had written a paper for one of the leading periodicals in Germany, in which he insisted on the force of the *a posteriori* proof of the existence of God, a Lutheran minister wrote to him, asking further light on certain points of the argu-

ment and offering some objections. Fr. H. answered the letter, and a public correspondence ensued which aroused the interest of, among others, a young atheist at one of the Universities, who asked to take part in the discussion. A year had passed since the last answer of Fr. H. had appeared, when he received the intelligence that the young atheist had committed suicide in despair of help from the God whom he had set himself to deny in life. At the same time the minister who conveyed this knowledge to the priest wrote: "Do not think, however, Rev. Father, that the trouble you took to convince him of the existence of God was in vain, for I can add the happy news that it has borne salutary fruits for my own son. It happened in this, as in so many disputations, that those engaged in debate talk themselves deeper into their own views; the most convincing reasons are unable to convince either to see his opponent's position, or to admit himself wrong. With the unbiased listener it is otherwise. Such was my son; for although his friend had won him over to the monistic theory, he had preserved a sufficiently calm judgment to be able to weigh dispassionately the pros and cons. He has found again the faith of his childhood, and his life since then is much more regular. God be thanked for it! Unfortunately, I must add, since these events my son has a decided leaning towards Catholicism. This 'unfortunately' you must pardon, Rev. Father, to an Evangelical pastor, etc."

The translation is excellent and enters fully into the genius of the English tongue.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE CHURCH OF ST. ANTONY OF PADUA, Brooklyn, N. Y., with an account of the Rectorship of the Rev. P. F. O'Hare, published on the occasion of his Silver Jubilee, March 19, 1897.

We mention this "sketch" as exemplifying a class of publications which has become quite popular of late years. The jubilee celebrations of honored personages and useful institutions are made the occasion of permanent records likely to serve the future historian as landmarks. In the present instance, "the tale of work well done, of agencies established for the spiritual benefit of souls, and especially for the safe-guarding of the young" is, in the words of the compiler, intended primarily for the edification of the parishioners, and to encourage them in their effort to uphold the hands of their

zealous pastor. What gives a special value to this memorial of harmonious activity of priest and people is the dedication which inscribes the narrative as a tribute from the assistant priests to the fidelity of their pastor.

The sketch goes back some fifty years, and illustrates, in a marked way, the progress of Catholic prosperity. In this respect, the history of St. Antony's Church is only a repetition of the growth of most other parishes in the great centres of American life. There are many useful lessons to be gleaned from the study of pastoral pioneer work, lessons of sacrifice, of prudence, of charity, and, above all, of gratitude, which characteristics are neatly interwoven in the lines of the introductory Ode, by the well-known poet, Miss Donnelly. The illustrations and press-work give the story of the parish an attractive outer form in keeping with the style of writing and general purpose of the book.

THE FALCON OF LANGÉAC. By Isabel Whiteley. Boston: Copeland and Day. 1897.

The romanticism of Stevenson—Sir Walter's spirit *redivivus*—is not, let us hope, soon to become obsolete, when it finds such admirable exponents as Stanley Weyman, and the author of "The Falcon of Langéac." "Under the Red Robe" stole into what has long been considered the closed chapter of Dumas, Sr.; and, if it did not erase the queer mixture of Gallic impossibilities and objectionable *plaisanteries* chronicled there, wrote itself in characters that were clear, clean and interesting. "The Falcon" has attempted a similar flight, and has sustained the traditional powers of that splendid bird. The story holds to the end the interest created in the beginning. As we read this chronicle of adventures, the young Sieur de Langéac seems to us a second Froissart, with all his quaintness and vividness, but without his occasionally tedious details. The perspicuous expression and engaging style of the narrative remind us not a little of Stevenson; while the picturesque illustrations of French scenery and character assure us that the author is personally familiar with the *locale* of her story. As in Stevenson's "Kidnapped" and "David Balfour," the interest depends less on elaboration of plot and expectancy created of a dramatic *denouement* than on the variety and multiplicity of incidents crowding the pages with life and action. The novel is in no formal sense a Catholic novel—the only finger-post in it that points to its Catholic authorship being the

quiet and unpretentious sweetness investing the Catholic scenes, characters and incidents with which it has to do. Surrounding all is the quaint atmosphere of Breton romance.

One detail that might invite criticism is the hero's assertion that "There is nothing, I think, that shows a man's soul like delirium . . . it is in the unconscious moments the truth will show, and I doubt if a man could wittingly disclose to confessor the secrets of his heart as he would do in the ravings of delirium. My friend Aylmer stood this test well. . . ." This states formally, and with show of reasoning, what is in truth a popular misconception, capable of breeding any amount of rash judgments and unworthy suspicions. The innocence, unstained because unassailed, would scarce present any harsh features in delirium, while the far higher innocence which has been sustained throughout storms of temptations might very easily repeat in delirium the images, doubts, blasphemies, which, because they had proved serious assaults, most likely acted with great force on the imagination, and would therefore constitute lasting, but unconscious, survivals over the calmer impression of holy thoughts.

The portrait of the young Sieur is very happily drawn. In her able sketch of this type of young masculinity the author has given a Roland for Charles Reade's Oliver—for Reade's forte (at least in his own estimation) was his knowledge of "Woman's way."

We recommend the novel to all who desire a romantic breathing-space, in this weary workaday world, amidst scenery that constitutes a veritable "change of air," and with companions whose deeds will stir the sluggish conventionalized blood of these days into exhilarating activity.

After penning this notice, we were scarcely surprised to learn that the first edition of a thousand copies had been exhausted in ten days after publication. H. T. H.

WHAT CHRIST REVEALED. Rev. L. Jouin, S. J. St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y. Pp., 100. Price, 10 cents.

This little book is intended to be "a brief but reasoned exposition of the principal doctrines which constitute the faith of a Catholic." A perusal of its pages proves how well the author carried out his intention. He has grouped his subject-matter—"What Christ Revealed"—under three heads, viz.: 1. The Church that teaches; 2. The Creed that is taught; 3. The Sacraments that sanctify.

The author covers the entire field of Catholic doctrine. He moves rapidly from point to point, stating briefly the Church's teaching, and assigning pithy reasons as he goes, answering difficulties and objections, and noting the chief heresies. As an example of Father Jouin's swift and clear style, we may cite the following: "We are also taught that the Mother of Christ was conceived and born into this world without Original Sin. That is what we believe by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This means that at the first moment of her existence in the womb of her mother she was clothed with sanctifying grace. This privilege was accorded her because she was to be the mother of the Redeemer of mankind. Then she was not redeemed by Christ, it is argued, because she never was in sin. On the contrary, she reaped more benefit from the Redemption than any one else. Her redemption did not consist in being freed from the slavery of sin, but in being prevented from falling into it."

Every page of this little book teems at once with sound teaching and interesting instruction. It will meet with a ready welcome among all classes of Catholics, and find its place equally in the home and in the Sunday-school. Put into the hands of busy Protestants it should be the means of dispelling many errors, and of awakening further inquiry into the faith it so clearly portrays.

Its value is further enhanced by marginal notes, which give the gist of each paragraph. The price, 10 cents, should make it popular.

IMMORTELLES OF CATHOLIC COLUMBIAN LITERATURE, Compiled from the Works of American Catholic Women Writers, by the Ursulines of New York. Illustrated. Chicago and New York. D. H. McBride & Co. 1897. Pp. 625.

The Ursuline Religious of New York deserve well of the Catholic reading public for this collection of flowers of literature gathered from the many fields cultivated by Catholic women in America, during the present and past generations. It is only from such a collection that one can estimate the quantity and quality of the literary work accomplished and accomplishing by the Catholic women in our midst. Extracts are here presented from the works of some sixty and more writers. The selections in each case are introduced by a biographical sketch of the authoress. There has been no attempt at classification or analysis of material.

The volume is well adapted for its special purpose, to serve namely as a Reading-book in our parochial and convent schools. The general character of the work, moreover, the quality of the subjects presented and its material aspect claim for the volume a place among the premiums on distribution-day.

PENNSYLVANIA, COLONY AND COMMONWEALTH. By Sydney George Fisher, author of "The Making of Pennsylvania."—Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates & Co. 1897. Pp. 442. 12mo.

Last year the Lippincotts published "The Making of Pennsylvania," by Mr. Fisher, and before the lapse of six months the book was followed by a second edition. In the meantime the present volume was announced as completing the history of Pennsylvania down to the eighteenth century. Though we have a number of works dealing with the subject, there was good reason for writing a new compendium. "There is no State," says our author, "whose early history has been so thoroughly misunderstood. . . . Our position during the Revolution is an unexplored domain of which there is no connected account. . . . Our own writers have scarcely touched upon it; and the little that has been written is by opponents of the State inspired by prejudice, and not inclined to uphold either the conduct of our people or the character of our public men."

To the realization of this want of a truthful and impartial history of Pennsylvania Mr. Fisher joins another valuable qualification of the local historian. He states it as his conviction that a truthful history of the State demands for its intelligent understanding a clear exposition of the numerous nationalities and religions which made up the population of the province. Accordingly these elements are distinctly emphasized by our author in drawing an outline of the social and political history of the State.

Very naturally we look upon the Quakers not only as the founders of what is called the Pennsylvania Commonwealth, but as its greatest benefactors. For a hundred years they controlled the policy and legislation of the province, laying the foundation for the perpetuation of that spirit of good order and forbearance which is still a striking trait of its population.

Apart from this typical class of Pennsylvania people the author devotes detailed attention to the doings of the Dutch, Swedes,

English, Germans, Welsh and Scotch-Irish, together with their different religions—Lutheran, Reformed, Episcopalian, Tunker, Mennonite, Schwenkfelder, Moravian and Presbyterian.

A Catholic (every sixth man in Philadelphia) who might be disposed to take up this book, will, if he remembers the protection which his forefathers received at the hands of William Penn, himself most loyal to the Catholic King James II., whose subject he was, look for some data regarding his co-religionists in 1686, or later, when Penn wrote to James Logan about them. Fathers Harding, and Schneider and Molyneux, not to mention others, were conspicuous names in Pennsylvania's early days, despite their modest and unpretentious lives, and some of our Protestent annalists have done them justice in recognizing their services in the moral elevation of that class of the people which was not amenable to the quiet discipline of the Quakers. The mission of Goshenhoppen was not only extensive but prosperous, through the zeal of its priests, who taught the people the arts of thrift and industry as well as the science of salvation. The same is true of Conewago. It can hardly be called an exaggeration if we say that long before Prince Demetrius Gallitzin founded the mission of Loretto in the Alleghanies, Pennsylvania numbered more than ten thousand Catholics among its most law-abiding and thrifty citizens. Prince Gallitzin, who went under the simple name of Mr. Smith, had spent a fortune of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to purchase land for the poor people, as the priests had done in Goshenhoppen and elsewhere. He lived there for over forty years, and the twelve families, settled in the district when he went there, had before his death given place to a Catholic population of nine thousand. He built churches, founded villages, brought together the people to harmonious action for good. Yet of all this we find no mention in a history that proposes to take special account of such elements. There are pages on pages devoted to the Moravians, the Presbyterians, the Church of England men, to the German, and the Scotch-Irish, and the Welsh ; but nothing is said of Catholics, of gallant and representative Irish Catholics who had no sympathy with the Scotch-Irish rioters. We find Smiths and Browns and a host of other names in the Index, but no Barry, or Moylan, or Fitzsimmons, men of eminence in the civil and military service of the days included in the history before us. In two or three places we find a reference to the Roman or Romish practice, and something is said about Catholics existing in very small num-

bers, or that there were also "native American and Catholic riots," leaving the reader in doubt whether or not the Catholics made the riot or rather suffered from it by the fanaticism of an anarchical set of would-be Americans.

This is surely not carrying out the canon laid down by the author himself when he condemns prejudice and especially that prejudice which neglects to point out the valuable traits of the people who united to build up the Commonwealth of the Keystone-State.

No doubt there are things which Pennsylvania Catholics may have to blush for because done in their name during the past century or before; but it was neither the fault of their principle, nor was it in excess of the countless services of self-sacrifice and loyalty which are to be ascribed to their credit by the impartial annalist. And a clear statement of this is all the more required by justice in the present case, because Mr. Fisher aims at reasoning out the motives which fostered the toleration, the thrift, the love of liberty and respect for authority in our people. If he will study the doctrine inculcated by the men whom we have mentioned above, he will find that it is infinitely more calculated to produce those civic and moral virtues which we esteem as the heritage of the Quakers, than the teaching of Barclay or of Fox; but the conditions of the people who listened to the Catholic missionaries were very different from those of the Friends, and the latter could no more have made them law-abiding citizens then than they can influence the average laboring classes of to-day.

Mr. Fisher writes of Pennsylvania as a respectable historian. For that reason he does not speak ill of any one; his policy is simply to ignore those whom he could not very well treat without a sneer or a fling, which might injure his position. But he will see no good in those whom he dislikes; they are the relations of servants, and whether good or bad must not be spoken of in his society. Such is the impression one receives of the two volumes. We care not to enter upon a detailed criticism which would place some of the facts illuminated by Mr. Fisher in a somewhat ridiculous light and put them out of all proportion to their circumstances. Some one of the learned members of the Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia will no doubt take up the task of showing how partial and unjust in reality Mr. Fisher's treatment of his subject is. We content ourselves with having described in general its characteristic trait.

SCRIPTURE MANUALS FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS. Edited by the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.—Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. T. A. Burge, O.S.B. Pp. 123.—The Gospel according to St. Luke. By the Rev. J. W. Darby, O.S.B., and the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J. Pp. 296.

These manuals are admirably adapted not only for use in schools and for examinations, but also for private study and reading circles. They cover the entire ground, giving the student a concise view of the biblical history, its application, and various meaning. The authorship, date, sources of composition are clearly outlined, followed by an analysis of the subject-matter, and the meaning of particular words. At the end of each chapter is a series of questions which greatly facilitate a review of the topics treated. The typography is excellent, and we unhesitatingly recommend the use of these handy volumes to all who wish to make intelligent reading of the Bible.

THREE DIALOGUES ON PULPIT ELOQUENCE. By Mgr. François de la Mothe Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai. Translated and illustrated by quotations from modern writers, with an introductory essay by the late Samuel J. Eales, M. A.—London: Thomas Baker. (Philadelphia: John J. McVey.) 1897. Pp. 174. Pr. $1.00.

The chief task of the preacher, according to the translation of Fénélon's excellent remarks on sacred oratory, is to present religious truths *touched with emotion;*—"winged with the energy and power, and the dynamic force of the preacher's own mind and soul, that so they may strike other souls, and impress and influence them powerfully, and finally win them to good." He argues in favor of a preacher's sincerity and depth of earnestness as qualities infinitely preferable to the polished elegance of a well-written sermon which is read from manuscript, and he believes that a study of Fénélon's "Dialogues" will largely aid in the acquisition of this talent in which lies the power of persuasion unto good. We know that the late Mgr. Dupanloup thought very highly of these "Dialogues," pronouncing them a work of consummate genius, and we have no doubt that the simplicity of style and the emphasis of disguised

repetition, implied by this method of enforcing certain practical truths regarding sacred eloquence, are very effective with the average reader

The conversation is between three persons, and covers three separate occasions. The relative merits of certain typical preachers are discussed, and thus the various points to be avoided and those to be cultivated are set forth. The first dialogue turns about the affectations of wit and brilliancy in sermons; it is shown that the object of eloquence is to instruct men and render them better, and that the orator who does not aim at this object fails to satisfy his duty. At the second meeting the principles of the art of oratory are discussed, with observations on the method of learning sermons and delivering them by heart, on the manner of dividing and subdividing one's matter. The last conversation treats in the main of the importance to be attached to the study of sacred Scripture in connection with preaching. The general subject matter of sermons and the style of the great preachers in treating the ordinary topics of the pulpit form also part of the discussion which ends with some alternate remarks about "panegyrics." The notes illustrative of certain portions of the "Dialogues" are cleverly chosen and add considerably to the interest of the volume, which is well printed and bound in the conventional style of bookmaking.

DE NATURALI INTELLIGENTIS ANIMAE CAPACITATE ATQUE APPETITU INTUENDI DIVINAM ESSENTIAM. Theologica Disquisitio (in Summam Theol. Thomae Aquinatis I. q. XII. a. 1.). Auctore Joachim Sestili, S. Th. D. Romae: Salvator Festa, 1896.

Those who have read and measured the impression upon the average reading public of Goldwin Smith's "Guesses at the Riddle of Existence," will know how to estimate the worth of tracts like the above. The fallacy of determining the existence or non-existence of truths by one's subjective state of mind, aided by the application of the senses, is not so apparent as we would suppose in view of the numerous errors committed constantly by reason of such an assumption. The callousness which comes over the minds and hearts of men who reason plausibly whilst they are in pursuit of present desires which they have set themselves to answer, is not the inheritance of mankind; yet mankind will somehow gladly accept the conclusions of these teachers who hold that if we seek truth,

the Author of it will enable us, in due time, to find it; yet add that "whether we find it cannot matter to Him; it may, conceivably, matter to Him whether we seek it."

Against all such notions, adorned with show of intellect and learned paraphrase, the doctrine of the scholastic theologians fortifies the student inclined to more profound search into the truth of psychical phenomena. They do not draw their conclusions from feeling or sense, although they account these as valuable quantities in making up their final application; but they follow with merciless rigor the laws of exact reasoning. Are there in us as rational beings a natural capacity and longing by which we are impelled toward God despite contrary forces of a lower nature? And if there be such capacity, what is its nature, what are the terms of its existence, what is its proportion compared with the finite nature of man and the infinite nature of God.

The answer to these and kindred questions establishes a basis for healthy reasoning upon man's destiny which render impossible those vagaries that lead the thoughtless by a species of mind-show from one doubt into another without ever satisfying that thirst for knowledge of eternal truth which is unquestionably innate in man.

Such is the practical purpose of the work before us, a purpose which we emphasize simply because it is generally ignored by those who are not habitually given to profound study of similar topics. For the rest, the author resumes the diverse views of many eminent teachers on the subject of which he treats, ending with a synthesis of the doctrine of St. Thomas. For the theological student the interest in such works is of a distinct character, and to them the title will suggest the advisability of entering upon the detailed disquisition of a fundamental topic the various phases of which have been debated in the Summa, by S. Bonaventure, Alexander of Hales, and a host of acute minds.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE FORMATION OF CHRISTENDOM. By T. W. Allies, K. C. S. G. Vol. I. The Christian Faith and the Individual. Pp. 323. Vol. II. The Christian Faith and Society. Pp. 410. Vol. III. The Christian Faith and Philosophy. Pp. 419. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1897.

FOUNDATIONS OF FAITH. From the German of Fr. L. von Hammerstein, S. J. Part I. The Existence of God Demonstrated. Pp. 307. The same.